DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 003	UD 009 313
AUTHOR	Wilsberg, Mary; Castiglione, Lawrence V.
TITLE	The Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Grades 1 and 2 and the Provision of Additional Materials: A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1967-68.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
Spons Agency	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Report No	CUE-A-095
Pub Date	Nov 68
Note	244p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$12.30
Descriptors	Content Analysis, Depressed Areas (Geographic), *Disadvantaged Schools, Elementary School Students, *Grade 1, *Grade 2, Instructional Programs, Paperback Books, Reading Improvement, *Student Teacher Ratio, Supplementary Reading Materials, Teacher Distribution, Test Results
Identifiers	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City

Abstract

A project to reduce teacher-pupil ratios and to provide additional educational materials was a subsection of a Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in New York City Poverty Area Schools. The teacher-pupil ratio was reduced to the level of one to fifteen in the first grades and one to twenty in the second grades. Eight dollars was alloted per child for purchasing extra supplies, one dollar of which was designated for the purchase of paperback books for the personal libraries of the children. The program was implemented in 240 schools, on which the report focuses in regard to evaluation of (1) the organization for instruction and deployment of staff, children and space, (2) the content and materials of the instructional program, particularly in reading, and (3) the strengths and weaknesses of the program as seen by school staff and administrators. Test results of the study, and sample questionnaire and interview forms used are appended. (KG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
A 095

New York City - General
ED034003
UD 009 313

New York City - General

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1967-68

Project No. 05BCD68

THE REDUCTION OF PUPIL-TEACHER RATIOS IN GRADES 1 & 2 AND THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools

Mary Wilsberg and
Lawrence V. Castiglione,
Evaluation Directors

Sydney L. Schwartz,
Evaluation Coordinator

November 1968

The Center for Urban Education

ED034003

09313 E

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

A PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN POVERTY AREA SCHOOLS:

The Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Grades 1 and 2 and the Provision of Additional Materials

Mary Wilsberg and
Lawrence V. Castiglione,
Evaluation Directors

Sydney L. Schwartz,
Evaluation Coordinator

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1967-68 school year.

Educational Research Committee

November 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I

Introduction

I Description of the Project 1

II Evaluation Design 5

III Program Organization 8

- Space Utilization 9
- Personnel 10
- Patterns of Class Organization 21
- Size of Classes 24
- Summary 26

IV The Instructional Program 29

- Summary 58

V School Personnel and Observer Perceptions 60

- Recommendations 65
- Parent Involvement 70
- Summary of Teacher Perceptions of the SEC Program 72
- Perceptions of Observers 75
- Recommendations for Program Modifications 76
- Summary 79
- School Personnel Perceptions and Recommendations 79
- Observer Perceptions and Recommendations 80

VI Conclusions and Recommendations 82

SECTION II

Project Goals 86

I Evaluation Design 88

II Selection of the Sample 89

III Tests and their Administration 91

IV Treatment of Data 94

V Interpretation of the Data 96

VI Conclusions and Recommendations 102

SECTION I

Appendix A: Tables A1

Appendix B: Instruments B1

Appendix C: Staff List C1

SECTION II

Appendix D: Rationale for Data Analysis D1

Appendix E: Sources of Variance of Data in Table 3 E1

Appendix F: Staff List F1

INTRODUCTION

A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools in New York City included six subsections:

A. Educational Assistant or Teacher Aide for Each Kindergarten Teacher

B. Teachers in Grade 1 to Reduce Teacher-Pupil Ratio to 1/15

C. Teachers in Grade 2 to Reduce Teacher-Pupil Ratio to 1/20

D. Additional Materials for Grades 1 and 2

E. Diagnosis and Special Instruction in Reading

F. Parental Involvement in Reading-Improvement Program

Each subsection, though directed to improving the effectiveness of the educational programs at the early childhood level had, to a large degree, an autonomous quality that required a separate evaluational program, except for Parts B, C, and D, which had a common setting for evaluative purposes. However, Parts B and C required two separate investigations, one directed to a description of the implementation of the program and professional perceptions of strengths and weaknesses, and the other directed to an analysis of pupil achievement in reading as reflected in test scores.

It is important for the reader to keep in mind that this evaluation report deals with three subsections (B, C, D) of a large, comprehensive program designed to improve early childhood educational programs in poverty area schools of New York City.

Throughout this study we received support and cooperation from the staff at the Center for Urban Education, from the Bureau of Research of the New York City Board of Education, from the administrative staff, program coordinators, teachers in the sample schools, as well as from many Early Childhood Education Supervisors, and first- and second-grade teachers who responded to questionnaires. We wish to gratefully acknowledge our appreciation to all of these people who gave so generously of their time and made this evaluation possible.

Sydney L. Schwartz
Evaluation Coordinator

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools in New York City (SEC program) was funded under Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The parts of the project evaluated in this report are:

Part B: Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Grade 1

Part C: Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Grade 2

Part D: Additional Materials for Grades 1 and 2

General objectives of the SEC program related to Parts B, C, and D, as outlined by the Board of Education, were:

> 1) "To provide improved conditions for teachers and students to achieve learning proficiency from the onset of schooling.
>
> 2) To remove obstacles to learning at the earliest recognizable stage."[1]

Further delineation of this goal was related to the reduction in pupil-teacher ratio:

> "The major purpose of these programs is to improve the reading level of children by means of a smaller pupil-teacher ratio. The ratio of 15 to 1 in the First Grade and 20 to 1 in the Second Grade will be maintained in the overall program."[2]

Additional staff funded for the SEC program included an inschool coordinator, selected and supervised by the principal, and given the responsibility for the program in first and second grades. The coordinator was to be an experienced teacher, knowledgeable in early childhood practices. Her role was described as follows:

> It is imperative...that the coordinator be completely free of all other responsibilities. She will be responsible . . . for:

---

[1] Board of Education, Summary of Proposed Programs, 1967-68, Title I -- Elementary and Secondary Act (New York: Board of Education), p. 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

1. Serving as liaison person with administrative and teaching personnel.
2. Previewing and listing appropriate visual aids and basic instructional materials for teacher selection.
3. Scheduling use of space and equipment.
4. Guiding weekly cooperative planning sessions.
5. Guiding and assisting in pupil grouping and regrouping in selected areas of instruction.
6. Evaluating the "profile record" of each child.
7. Guiding student teachers and/or apprentice teachers in their assignments in this program.
8. Acting as liaison person between school and community.
9. Giving demonstration lessons.
10. Arranging for parent-teacher conferences.
11. Giving appropriate short-term informal tests in order to assess individual needs leading to flexibility in grouping.
12. Assisting in writing needed rexograph materials.[3]

The implementation of the SEC program in the schools was intended to be varied, with a number of options suggested by the central office of the Board of Education. "Many methods of instruction may be tried. Samples of patterns will be made available to the schools."[4]

The selection of organizational pattern by individual schools was to be determined by the school settings and the program emphases were specified as follows:

> "Understanding of developmental needs of little children; of special needs of the disadvantaged.

---

[3] Board of Education, The Improvement of Reading by Means of Smaller Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Grades 1 and 2, Exhibit 1 - (Patterns), (New York: Board of Education, 1967), p. 2.

[4] Ibid., p. 32.

Curriculum for early childhood.

Methods of teaching reading.

Enrichment of materials for building reading program.

Diagnosis of reading difficulties.

Evaluation of progress.

Teacher training.

Community and parent involvement, participation, and training."[5]

A variety of alternatives was proposed for schools where limited space prohibited the establishment of single classes at the prescribed ratio. Such alternatives included the following specifications: (1) each teacher, except the coordinator, is to have a homeroom class, (2) additional teachers (funded under ESEA funds as part of the SEC program) may not be used as OTP's (Other than Teaching Personnel).

Beyond these specifications, flexibility was considered the key goal in establishing an organizational plan.

> Wherever a pattern indicates two teachers in a classroom, flexible grouping is desirable. The number of children within each group will depend upon the abilities, levels, and special needs of the children - based on teachers' analyses.[6]

Flexibility was also emphasized within class groups and across grade lines, so that smaller groups, based on common needs and talents would be developed within the curricular plan.

> Large or total group instruction may be feasible for special activities; special assembly programs, audio-visual, dance festival, etc.[7]

To facilitate flexibility of grouping, coordinated scheduling of preparation periods was recommended so that teachers across grade lines might arrange group planning periods. Models for alternatives for scheduling planning groups and preparation periods were offered in the planning committee report.[8]

---

[5] Ibid., p. 32-3.

[6] Ibid., p. 4.

[7] Ibid., p. 4.

[8] Ibid., pp. 5-9.

Part D of the SEC program, Additional Materials for Grades 1 and 2, specified the following:

> "Each school will be allocated an additional $8 per capita to provide books and other materials of instruction. Among the recommendations is a plan to supply 3 to 4 paperback books which children will own so that they may gain experience in starting home libraries."[9]

The stated objectives of this part of the program included: "...to develop a love of books and a desire to read among pupils in grades 1 and 2 in Special Service Schools and to enrich the materials for reading readiness in grades 1 - 2."[10]

These objectives were implemented in the following ways: (1) The Board of Education at the central office circulated a list of paperback books recommended for purchase; (2) It also circulated instructions for ordering readiness and reading materials from the regular textbook and library lists.

The ordering of additional classroom materials to enrich existing materials was to be limited to "...materials which are needed for use by individual children or for class or grade-level use. Insofar as possible, materials ordered should serve to enrich the reading materials available rather than provide additional basic materials."[11]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 34.

[10] Ibid., p. 34.

[11] Board of Education, Books and Instructional Materials for Use in the Reading-Improvement Program, Grades 1-2, Circular, June 7, 1962, New York.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION DESIGN

In planning this evaluation and report, we have recognized that the school year began later than usual because of the teacher strike, and that the evaluational procedure was initiated only a few months after the program was implemented. This report should not be interpreted as a study of the program's ultimate worth, but rather as an initial investigation designed to provide the following: (1) a description of program implementation during the first year; (2) evidence of the program's potential strengths, realized strengths, and weaknesses; (3) a basis for recommendations for modification of the program.

Selection of the Sample

The original plan for implementation of the SEC program included 267 schools, designated as Special Service Schools, located in 25 of the 30 school districts in New York City. By late fall, this number had decreased to 240 schools, according to the amended list given the evaluation directors. A random selection of one special service school in each participating district (excluding Richmond County) provided a sample population of 24 schools. In addition, one school receiving the SEC program, though not designated as a special service school, was added to establish a sample population of 25 schools in 25 districts, slightly above a 10 percent sample.

In each school selected for intensive study, three first grades and two second grades were observed. The program coordinators in each school were asked to select both experienced and inexperienced teachers for observation and a representative sampling of classroom organization. The 75 observed first grades represented 5 percent of the funded grade 1 programs (1,450), and the 50 second grades represented 9 percent of the funded grade 2 programs (620).

In order to extend this investigation beyond the sample, an additional population of first and second grade teachers in each special service school was randomly selected to receive mailed questionnaires. This additional population brought the size of the sample of teachers to be contacted up to 33 percent at each grade level.

The total population (23) of Early Childhood Education (ECE) supervisors in all districts having the SEC program were included in the study.

The Observers

The evaluation team consisted of nine observers (see Appendix C), each of whom had a strong background of experience on the elementary school level and advanced studies in elementary school curriculum and teaching. All observers were faculty members associated with teacher education programs in colleges of The City University of New York and were familiar with urban education.

Each observer was responsible for the observational visits and interviews in either two or three schools. To facilitate rapport and to determine whether changes occurred between winter and spring visits, observers kept the same schools throughout the year. Before each series of visits, orientation meetings were held in which the purpose of the evaluation, its procedures, and the instruments to be used were presented and reviewed. During one meeting, the Teacher and Supervisor Questionnaires were presented for critical evaluation before final forms were made. Feedback sessions followed each series of visits. At the winter feedback session, observers made a critical assessment of the instruments used and presented descriptions of programs observed. During the final feedback session, observers gave reactions and recommendations based on the evidence obtained. Such evidence was essentially a description of the program organization. It did not include qualitative judgments of specific teacher behaviors.

Procedures

For purposes of this evaluation, two sources of data were stressed: (1) observational visits to the schools; (2) perceptions of the professional participants.

The observational schedule called for two sets of visits to each school in the sample, with each set comprising three days in a school. The first round took place at the earliest possible time in late January and early February; the second round, in late May and the first week in June, was considered the optimum time to ascertain maximum implementation of the program.

Instruments for observations were developed after discussions with Board of Education personnel and exploratory visits to Special Service Schools not included in the sample. The instruments were designed to obtain descriptions of deployment of staff and children, the use of space, and of the quality and quantity of materials of instruction. The thrust of the evaluational procedure was to obtain descriptions of the patterns of organization for instruction rather than specific teaching behaviors.

The instruments used during the winter school visits were a classroom observation guide; interviews with teachers, primary assistant principal, and coordinator; and a questionnaire to the coordinator. The instruments used during the spring school visits were a classroom observation guide and interviews with the principal and the coordinator. Questionnaires were sent to teachers in all Special Service Schools and to ECE supervisors in all districts participating in the SEC program.

All members of the evaluation team compiled two types of summary reports: a school summary report after each set of visits to a school, and an overall summary report of programs observed. These two instruments furnished an interpretation of the body of data.

Instruments for ascertaining the perceptions of the professional participants were mainly questionnaires and structured interviews, used singly or in combination. A random sample of the general body of first-and second-grade teachers were solicited for their perceptions via a questionnaire mailed out in April. This questionnaire, which was also sent to teachers observed in the sample schools, was intended to obtain a broad look at the implementation of the program throughout the city, and to verify the reliability of the sample as representative of the total population in terms of perceptions of strengths, weaknesses, and general patterns of implementation.

Certain questions were included in all questionnaires or interviews for school personnel. These questions pertained to perceptions of assets and liabilities of the program, ratings of value of the program as implemented, and recommendations. Lists of assets were encompassed in two types of questions, a checklist type question and open-ended questions directed to listing resolved and unresolved problems.

The data pertaining to Part D of the SEC program, Additional Materials, was obtained primarily through questions to teachers to determine whether or not paperback books were received, how many books were distributed to each child, and judgments of the appropriateness of books received.

This evaluation took into consideration the goal relative to increased community and parent involvement as it pertained to organizational structure. However, Part E of the SEC program proposal, Parental Involvement Program, was evaluated separately.

CHAPTER III

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

STAFF ORIENTATION

An orientation for SEC program coordinators, consisting of five training sessions, was held by district personnel prior to the opening of school in the fall. Evaluative ratings of these orientation sessions, by the 16 district ECE supervisors who returned the questionnaire, are compiled in Table 1.

TABLE 1

EFFECTIVENESS OF ORIENTATION SESSIONS FOR COORDINATORS

Rating	No. of ECE Supervisors (N=16)
Very effective	1
Effective	6
Slightly effective	3
Slightly ineffective	0
Ineffective	4
Don't know	1
No response	1

Many schools reported that the teacher strike in September severely curtailed orientation plans. Only six of the 25 schools in the sample reported orientation for teachers, prior to the opening of schools. For these six, one to two hours was spent orienting the more experienced teachers and two to five hours spent orienting new teachers. Seventeen additional schools reported special orientation sessions, after school started, five of which were limited to the new teaching staff. Two schools did not respond.

The leadership of the orientation sessions varied considerably to include the coordinator alone, the coordinator with the school supervisory staff, the assistant principal, the principal, or the district ECE supervisor. Principals' and ECE supervisors' ratings of the effectiveness of these fall orientation programs for teachers are reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2

EFFECTIVENESS OF FALL ORIENTATION OF TEACHERS

Ratings	ECE Supervisors (N=16)	Principals (N=25)
Very effective	1	2
Effective	9	7
Slightly effective	4	9
Slightly ineffective	1	1
Ineffective	0	1
Don't know	1	2
No orientation	0	3

SPACE UTILIZATION

Use of space was one of the major problems in setting up the programs, as reported by the coordinators -- the limited space available, the assignment of teaching personnel to space, and the scheduling for use of auxiliary space. Space accommodations were still considered a major problem by coordinators and teachers at the end of the school year.

Fourteen schools reported making no space adjustments to accommodate the program. Either each teacher had her own classroom, or a combination of single and paired classes existed and instruction was carried on within the confines of the classroom.

Of the ten schools noting adjustments in space, two reported resorting to split sessions, one with split sessions for the first-and second-grade program, and the other only for first grades. The remaining schools reported the following adjustments: the freeing of some classrooms for subgroup instruction; the use of large kindergarten rooms for first grades; the use of offices, teachers' rooms, the lunchroom, the auditorium, the gym, and cloakrooms for subgroup instruction. Where classrooms were freed for subgroup instruction, one school made available three classrooms; one school used two remedial rooms; two schools used two classrooms; three schools used from one to four other classrooms on a part-time basis.

PERSONNEL

Those most actively involved in the SEC program were, of course, the coordinators and the first- and second-grade teachers. In addition, it was expected that regularly assigned resource personnel in each school would continue to work with the first and second grades. The primary assistant principal was expected to continue to carry out administrative functions related to these grade levels. Principals, too, were involved in administrative aspects of the program. District early childhood education supervisors devoted a portion of their time to the program. The use of paraprofessionals was not built into the program originally. However, the Board of Education reported that some districts had been authorized to hire paraprofessionals as assistants in schools where allotted teacher positions were not filled.

The Coordinator

The principal had the responsibility for the selection and supervision of the coordinator. Twenty-three schools, of the 25 in the sample, reported having filled the coordinator position. In two schools where the primary assistant principal served as coordinator, the coordinator's positions were used for the assignment of subject matter specialists. One school reported having no primary assistant principal, thereby adding to the responsibilities of the coordinator in that school.

All program coordinators were female. Table 3 reports the educational and experience background and license of those serving in the coordinator position.

TABLE 3

BACKGROUND OF COORDINATORS (N=25)

Undergraduate Education			Graduate Education	
B.A. Elem. Education	B.A. in Other Educ. Areas	B.A. in Liberal Arts	M.A. or M.S. In Elem. Educ.	Graduate Credits
12	2	11	13	12

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1 yr.	2-5 yrs.	6-10 yrs.	10 yrs. up
1	7	3	14

LICENSE

Early Childhood	Common Branches	Assistant Principal
5	18	2

Coordinators were asked to approximate the number of hours per week they were spending on their various responsibilities. Conferences with the primary assistant to principal were included because coordinators reported that they received considerable help from, and worked closely with, the primary assistants to principal. Table 4 indicates coordinators' responses.

As indicated in Table 4, different coordinators emphasized different aspects of their role, with each of the coordinators indicating no involvement with some of the designated responsibilities. During the course of the year, the number of demonstration lessons conducted by coordinators ranged from two to 100.

TABLE 4

RESPONSIBILITIES ASSUMED BY COORDINATORS

N=23[a]

Responsibility	Number of Hours Per Week Spent					Range of Hours Per Week Spent
	0	1-3	4-10	10 up	NR[b]	
Liaison work with administrators and teaching personnel	1	14	6	1	1	0 - 10
Previewing and listing A-V & instructional materials[c]	3	14	3	2	1	0 - 20
Scheduling use of space and equipment[c]	11	12	0	0	0	0 - 3
Group planning with teachers	7	11	4	1	0	0 - 10
Individual planning with teachers	1	13	6	2	1	0 - 15
Grouping children[c]	6	14	3	0	0	0 - 5
Assessing pupil progress	4	12	6	1	0	0 - 3
Parent-related work	4	8	7	4	0	0 - 30
Conferences with the primary assistant principal	2	14	4	1	2	0 - 10
Teaching	4	1	12	6	0	0 - 23

[a] Two acting coordinators were assistants to principal with other responsibilities as well. They are therefore not included in this table.

[b] NR signifies No Response.

[c] More hours were devoted to these responsibilities in the fall.

In 19 of the schools coordinators assumed a regularly scheduled teaching slot in subgroup instruction, usually in language arts, while in other schools they took no part in classroom instruction. Two coordinators reported covering for teacher preparation periods and two reported assuming administrative tasks not listed in the official guidelines.

In most schools the supervisors set the areas of emphasis with, and for the coordinator. Two coordinators reported having to work out their own job descriptions without the help of the principal. Fourteen coordinators found the principal extremely helpful, three slightly helpful, and six reported that the principal was of no help.

Almost one-third (seven) of the coordinators reported no cooperative group planning with teachers, though they did indicate some time spent in planning with individual teachers. Seventeen coordinators reported that they were able to arrange meetings with all the teachers on one grade level, at the same time, if they wished to.

Teachers in classes observed, and principals were asked to rate the effectiveness of the coordinator. These ratings related more to the quality of her work in her major areas of emphasis than to the number of functions in which she served. Table 5 reports their responses.

TABLE 5

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COORDINATOR

	Grade 1 Teachers (N=65)			Grade 2 Teachers (N=39)			
Rating	Paired	Single	Team	Paired	Single	Team	Principals (N=25)
Very effective	18	7	2	0	4	1	14
Effective	15	3	1	3	8	2	8
Slightly effective	10	2	0	2	10	0	3
Slightly ineffective	2	2	0	1	2	0	0
Ineffective	2	1	0	0	2	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	1	3	0	0

Ninety percent of first-grade teachers thought the role of coordinator was effectively carried out as did 76 percent of second-grade teachers. The higher percentage is not surprising since, in many schools, the coordinator devoted the greater portion of her time to the first-grade program. Twenty-two of the assistants to principal responding to the question, "How do you feel about the position of coordinator?" used adjectives such as "wonderful," "vital," and "absolute necessity," indicating that they regarded the coordinator's role as essential.

The Primary Assistant to Principal

Most coordinators reported having received help, particularly at the beginning of the year, from the primary assistants to principal. Three coordinators reported lack of delineation of the specific roles of the assistant to principal and the coordinator with regard to the Early Childhood Program. Table 6 reports the effect of the addition of the SEC program on the work load of the primary assistant to principal, as perceived by principals and assistants to principals.

TABLE 6

EFFECT OF THE ADDITION OF A COORDINATOR ON THE WORK LOAD OF THE PRIMARY ASSISTANT TO PRINCIPAL

Rating	Principal (N=25)	Assistant Principal (N=24)
Much heavier	0	8
Heavier	1	8
The same	3	6
A little lighter	4	2
Much lighter	14	0
Don't know	0	0
No coordinator	2	-
No ass't principal	1	-

Sixteen primary assistants to principal regarded their work load this year as heavier. This view was not supported by principals. The following quotes represent the feelings of primary assistants to principal who regarded their role as heavier:

> Scheduling to liberate rooms for small group instruction takes much time. Personality clashes, which the A.P. must mediate, take considerable time, as does trying to have a variety of programs for children, when teachers are being covered by cluster teachers.
>
> The job is never finished -- always reorganizing. Teachers feel unsure and need more guidance.

Those who felt their work load was the same, or a little lighter, are represented by the following comments:

> If time wasn't spent on this program, it would be spent on other work. Having the additional rotation (floater) teachers to work with, and problems of adjustment and the defining of roles takes time.
>
> Role made simpler by consulting with the coordinator. We have defined roles to eliminate confusion, on the part of teachers, as to roles of coordinator and assistant principal.

The Early Childhood Education Supervisor

Sixteen of the 23 district supervisors returned a questionnaire seeking information about their participation in the SEC program. (Two districts had no supervisors appointed this year.) Table 7 summarizes their responses.

Supervisors emphasized different aspects of their role in relation to the SEC program. Entries in the categories of meetings with administrative personnel and with coordinators included both individual and group meetings.

The coordinators' perceptions of the ECE supervisor's role are as follows: four found the supervisor extremely helpful, seven found her slightly helpful, and 12 found her of no direct help to the school's program.

TABLE 7

RESPONSIBILITIES ASSUMED BY THE ECE SUPERVISOR
(N=16)

	Districts															
Schools and Programs	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
No. Special Service Schools	14	3	4	15	19	5	12	12	0[a]	17	12	9	3	20	1	11
No. Schools Visited	13	3	4	15	18	5	9	12	1	17	12	9	3	20	1	11
Percent of Time with:																
Prekindergarten	20[c]	25	20	25	-[b]	30	NR	15	25	15	30[c]	20	-[b]	20	25	40
Kindergarten	25	25	50	25	-[b]	50	NR	50	25	25	25	20	40	20	25	40
First Grade	12½	25	15	25	60	10	NR	30	40	50	20	40	40	30	25	10
Second Grade	12½	25	15	25	40	10	NR	5	10	10	20	20	20	30	25	10

ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE GRADE 1 AND 2 PROGRAMS
(REPORTED BY ECE SUPERVISORS)
(N=16)

	Average No.		Total No.
District Meetings with Teachers	6	No. participating in orientation of co-ordinators	10
Meetings with Admin. Personnel	8	No. participating in preparation of written guides	2
Meetings with co-ordinators	10	No participating in district workshops	1

---

[a] One school, while not classified as special service, was designated as a poverty area school and provided with reduced ratios.

[b] This level was covered by other personnel.

[c] Only 95 percent of time reported by respondent.

The Teaching Staff

The variety of labels for teaching positions, the diverse roles, and the differing assignments carried out under a given label for a position, made the task of describing the teaching staff involved in SEC programs a difficult and complex one. The majority of the first- and second-grade teaching positions were designated as classroom teaching positions. Other designations included such terms as: floater, cluster, ratio, and team teacher. These terms will be defined further on in this report.

There was a higher ratio of beginning teachers in the first-grade level than at the second-grade level. Table 8 reports the numbers of experienced and beginning teachers working in the SEC programs in the sample schools.

TABLE 8

TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF FIRST AND SECOND GRADE TEACHERS IN SAMPLE SCHOOLS

	Grade 1 (N=332)		Grade 2 (N=208)	
Experience	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
With Experience	176	53	146	70
Without any Prior Experience	131	40	46	22
Interns (I.T.T.)[a]	25	7	16	8

[a] I.T.T. = Teachers prepared under Intensive Teacher Training Program.

The competency of the teacher staff in the sample schools, as judged by coordinators, is reported in Table 9.

TABLE 9

COMPETENCY OF TEACHERS AS JUDGED BY COORDINATORS

Level of Competency	Grade 1 (N=332) Number	Grade 1 (N=332) Percent	Grade 2 (N=208) Number	Grade 2 (N=208) Percent
Competent	156	50	120	59
Adequate	87	27	59	25
Inadequate	40	11	17	9
Not judged	49	12	12	7

Many schools initially assigned teachers to positions according to teaching experience, with most schools adopting a policy of placing one experienced and one inexperienced teacher in each paired classroom, thereby utilizing the experienced teacher as a teacher trainer, to some degree. Other schools used a variety of criteria as a basis for teacher assignment. Reassignment was reported in some situations where paired teachers were not compatible. Table 10 reports the frequency of mentions of criteria used by schools, in the fall, in assigning teachers to positions.

TABLE 10

BASIS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO TEACHING POSITIONS IN 25 SAMPLE SCHOOLS[a]

Criteria	Grade 1 Classroom	Grade 2 Classroom	Cluster, or Floater
Personality of teachers	13	10	5
Length of experience	18	13	5
Requests of teachers	14	11	5
Rotation	2	4	1

[a] Multiple responses were offered and are included in this table.

It is not possible to present detailed, accurate figures on the utilization of allotted SEC program positions because of conflicting reports given by various personnel in the schools. Differences of responses were attributed either to lack of common terminology for certain positions, or to different interpretations by school personnel of the functions to be carried out in designated positions. An attempt was made, for data gathering purposes, to define specific positions. For example, the floating teacher position was defined as one in which a teacher did not have a physical classroom of her own, but served two or three classrooms, often as a specialist in reading or language arts, or in the teaching of non-English speaking children. Her function was to provide more small-group teaching opportunities in the classes she serviced. In the 25 sample schools, nine of 332 first-grade positions and 31 of 208 second-grade positions were designated under the title of "floater teacher." This position was often referred to also as cluster, ratio, or team teacher. Eight positions (first and second grade) in the sample schools were designated under the titles of cluster, speech, or language positions. Prior to this year, the cluster designation usually referred to the teacher who covered teacher preparation period. Though the cluster teacher position continued to retain this meaning in some schools, in others, a whole or partial SEC program position was used to cover teacher preparation periods. Thus, the reference to the program position of floater or ratio teacher often was interchangeable with the term cluster position of previous years. Six schools reported that teaching positions allotted to the SEC program were used elsewhere in the school or used partially to fill cluster positions allotted to the schools prior to the introduction of the SEC program.

The term, ratio, was also used to refer to what was defined as a floater position. The designation of ratio for the position grew from the fact that all teachers were required, this year, to maintain a rollbook student population for the purpose of teacher-pupil ratio records; the ratio teacher, who also maintained a rollbook, performed the same functions as those performed by a teacher designated as a floater in another school, or team teacher in still other schools. The designation of team teacher usually meant the third of three teachers, the one without her own actual class, except for rollbook purposes. Team teaching was a form of organization in which three teachers were assigned to two early childhood classes, with the third teacher dividing her services between the other two teachers.

Still another complicating factor in sorting out teaching positions serving the SEC program was the use and function of other resource personnel ordinarily assigned to poverty area schools, such as the non-English coordinator, the guidance counselor, and auxiliary teachers. An attempt was made to determine whether or not regularly assigned resource personnel were continuing to serve the first- and second-grade programs. Only gross responses could be rendered in tabular form, again because of varied interpretations by respondents as to what positions constituted the roster of the school's regularly assigned auxiliary teaching personnel.

Seven schools reported no utilization for the SEC program, of regularly assigned resource personnel. Four schools reported none, except for the guidance counselor, and seven reported none, except for the non-English coordinator. Eight schools reported using reading, speech, art, or music teachers. Regular resource personnel who covered classes during teachers preparation periods were often referred to as cluster teachers.

All schools reported that four 45-minute preparation periods a week were provided for teachers, usually by a cluster teacher covering the class in the teacher's absence. A few schools reported a fifth period for first-grade classroom teachers. This additional fifth period was sometimes designated as time set aside for cooperative planning among teachers. Some of the confusion relating to class coverage is attributable to the fact that in case of teacher absence, with no substitute available the school administrators recruit any free teaching personnel to cover such classes.

Table 11 indicates that seven schools had real problems obtaining substitute teachers during a teacher's absence.

TABLE 11

AVAILABILITY OF SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS

Availability of Substitutes	No. of Schools N=25	Percentage
Yes, all of the time	4	16
Usually, but not always	14	56
About half of the time	4	16
Slightly under half of the time	2	8
Seldom	1	4

In situations where a substitute could not be obtained, either staff members other than classroom teachers were reassigned, or the children from uncovered classes were split up among other classrooms. At times when substitutes could not be obtained, either the number of subgroups was reduced, or class size was increased.

Other Adult Personnel

There was very limited use of paraprofessionals in the SEC program. Only four schools had paraprofessionals working in the first grades, and then only in some classes. One school reported the presence of a high school girl from a "600" school and two assistants in reading trained in the Two Bridges Project. Two schools had the services of unpaid mothers, or adult volunteers, and in one school a family assistant worked with the coordinator in the parent-community program. Six schools reported that paraprofessionals were shared by some of their second grades.

Student Population and Grouping

Student population figures within a school ranged from 73 to 378 children in the first grades, and from 81 to 366 children in the second grades. The predominate ethnic group, as reported by administrators, was Negro (see Appendix A1), with six schools reporting a Negro population of over 90 percent. The second largest group was Spanish speaking, consisting largely of children of Puerto Rican background, with some from the Dominican Republic and from Cuba. One school reported that 50 percent of their children were of Oriental background. The smallest population was "other," with ten schools reporting 1, or less, percent white population.

PATTERNS OF CLASS ORGANIZATION

The three major designations for organization of classrooms and teachers assigned to them were: single classrooms, paired classrooms, and a floating teacher arrangement. The SEC program plan called for a ratio of one first-grade teacher to 15 children and one second-grade teacher to 20 children. "Single class," in this report, refers to one teacher and a group of children, whatever the number, in the classroom. "Paired class" refers to two teachers in a classroom with a group of children, with a separate register and rollbook for each teacher for record keeping purposes. (Appendix A2 gives an example of a responsibility chart for teachers in a paired first grade.) The "floater arrangement" refers to situations where a third teacher was assigned to work, for part of each day, in either two or three classrooms. She did not have a classroom of her own, but she did have a "rollbook class" made up of students from the classrooms in which she worked. Classroom teachers took the roll and later the figures were transferred to the floating teacher's rollbook. (Appendix A3 gives an example of a program assigned to a cluster [or floater] teacher serving three classes. Her program includes small group instruction as well as periods when she takes over an entire class during the regular teacher's "preparation" periods. Appendix A4 gives an example of a combined assignment for a second grade ratio teacher working with two classes.) The floater arrangements were usually thought of as single classrooms serviced by a floater, ratio, team, or cluster teacher, who came at specified hours daily to assist in the classroom or to take out small groups for instruction.

When the floater arrangement was operative in a school, the entire grade level was not necessarily organized into clusters or teams, although this was the case in some schools.

The paired class organization was found far more frequently in first grades than in second grades. Table 12 reports the organization of classes in the sample schools at the time of the spring observations.

TABLE 12

ORGANIZATION OF CLASSES IN THE 25 SAMPLE SCHOOLS

	Grade Level	
Class Organization (N=25)	First	Second
All paired classes	10	1
All single classes	2	19
Both paired and single classes	13	5

Where both paired and single classes were present, some schools had only a few single classes while others had only a few paired classes. The number of classrooms available in a building was the most important factor in determining the number of single and paired classes. The next most important factor was the feeling of teachers about being paired. In the two schools where all first grades were organized into single classes, there was enough space to maintain approximately the 1/15 teacher-pupil ratio and give each teacher her own classroom. Two of the nineteen schools that had all single second-grade classes reported that in the second-grade phase of the SEC program, the reduced ratio had not been implemented.

One reason for the greater use of the floater arrangement among second-grade classes was that classrooms, when paired, become too crowded, with up to 40 children in a room that might accommodate no more than 30 comfortably. The teacher-pupil ratio, then, was met by having a third teacher work with groups from the two classes. In still other second-grade organizational plans, the floating teacher served three second-grade classes. In the one school where all second grades were paired, the size of each paired class was less than 40 children. Another factor that influenced school organizations toward using a greater number of second-grade single classes and floater patterns was the desire of many teachers to occupy a classroom alone.

Examination of schedules for first and second grades revealed some similarities in organization, other than the number of paired, single, and floater classrooms. (See Appendices A5 and A6.) One common factor was the designation of specific time periods during the day for instruction in given subject matter areas for all classes on a grade level. The most controlled designation of time and teaching assignment was in a school where the principal made a schedule card for each teacher.

Another common factor was the proportion of time devoted to reading and other language-arts instruction. More time was set aside for these than for any other curriculum areas. Mathematics was usually scheduled for a period each day, with less time designated for social studies and still less for science. Time devoted to speech, art, music, health education, and physical education varied more among programs than did time devoted to the "three R's." The availability of a gym or play area and the teaching specialty of cluster teachers were the determining factors.

A general pattern of teacher-pupil grouping for instruction emerged in paired classrooms. In reading instruction, each teacher usually worked with a subgroup, sometimes with the assistance of the SEC program coordinator, the non-English coordinator, or other teaching personnel taking a third group. In other curriculum areas teachers usually divided the responsibility for instruction, with one teacher usually working with the whole group. If the other teacher was not out of the room for her preparation period, she worked at her desk or gave some assistance to the teacher in charge. (See Appendices A2 and A6.)

In single classrooms, whatever the size, teachers usually worked alone in reading instruction. In some programs, a remedial reading or non-English teacher worked with individual children or small groups. When a speech or language-arts cluster teacher worked with a class, it was usually with the whole group during the regular teacher's preparation period. Other curriculum areas were taught either by the classroom teacher or, sometimes, by a cluster teacher or a specialist who was a regular school auxiliary resource person.

Implementation of the floater arrangement was more varied than patterns found among paired and single classroom settings. In some programs, the floater was assigned only to subgroup instruction in reading, to teaching other language arts, or to working with non-English speaking children. In other programs, the floater did a combination of subgroup instruction in reading and whole group instruction in another curriculum area. Some floaters were assigned to cover some preparation periods, others were not. Common to all floater arrangements were the physical arrangements -- the lack of the floater's own classroom and, sometimes, even of a desk of her own, and the lack of a group of children of her own, other than her rollbook class for record keeping purposes.

Regrouping for reading instruction and, sometimes, for mathematics occurred in some programs. Regrouping meant that children of similar reading ability were drawn from more than one class on a grade level to constitute a series of different ability groups. Sometimes these groups were smaller than whole class size because of the use of additional teaching personnel during reading time. Regrouping occurred most frequently in programs where classroom groupings were heterogeneous, or where the high and low achievers were grouped together.

Coverage for preparation periods was dealt with in a variety of ways. In some schools, regular auxiliary teaching personnel in the school were used along with teachers assigned only to the first-and/or second-grade program. In some paired class settings, teachers covered for each other all or some of the time. In floater settings, the floater, or ratio teacher, often covered for some of the preparation periods. (Teachers who covered for preparation periods were usually referred to as cluster teachers.)

More varied plans existed in the overall program organization at schools with a combination of classroom arrangements and with auxiliary classrooms and other space set aside for regularly scheduled subgroups. The paired first-grade class organization shown in Appendix A6 was set up in a school where one classroom was freed for use by all first-grade paired classes. This school also had single first-grade classes. The assembly periods from 2:00 to 3:00 on Tuesday and Thursday provided preparation periods for cooperative teacher planning, with half of the teachers using Tuesday and half using Thursday. In this program, each paired teacher had a group of 15 children for instruction in reading and language arts, and in mathematics. The two paired teachers had separate rooms for reading, but not for mathematics. All other instruction took place in a large group setting of 30 children with one teacher present, while the other teacher was freed for a preparation period.

SIZE OF CLASSES

The size of classes varied among schools and among classes within a school. A total of 56 different first grade classes were observed -- 15 single classes and 41 paired classes. All single class observations were half-day observations. Of the first-grade paired class observations, 22 were half day and 19 were full day. The ratio of observed single to paired first-grade classes was similar to the ratio of the total number of single (37) to the total number of paired classes (134) in the 25 sample schools. Table 13 reports the size of first-grade classes observed in the spring term.

The spring registers in Table 13 were similar to those of the winter except for a small reduction in the size of the two largest classes. These large single-class registers existed in cases where teachers expressed preference for a larger single class over a paired situation.

TABLE 13

SIZE OF FIRST GRADE CLASSES OBSERVED
(SPRING OF 1968)

	Single Classes; N=15				
	Under 15 Children	15 Children	16-19 Children	20-26 Children	30-31 Children
Number of Classes	2	2	5	2[a]	4

	Paired Classes; N=41				
	Under 25 Children	25-29 Children	30 Children	31-34 Children	35-37 Children
Number of Classes	2	9	7	16	7

[a] Teamed situation with 3 classes/2 rooms.

It was not surprising that the categories just above the anticipated teacher-pupil ratios of 1/15 and 2/30 were large, because the program coordinator was figured into the overall ratio. The complicated plan for achieving the ratio is best explained by the following simplified example. A school with 60 first-grade children enrolled would be, theoretically, assigned four teachers, to achieve the 1/15 ratio. However, since the coordinator is included in the ratio, only three teachers would be assigned, thereby establishing three classes of 20 children each, instead of the expected 15 pupils per class.

A total of 46 different second-grade classes were observed: 27 single classes, 12 classes with a floater arrangement, and seven paired classes. Of the seven paired classes, three were observed for a half day and four were observed for a full day. Table 14 presents the size of second-grade classes observed.

TABLE 14

SIZE OF SECOND GRADE CLASSES OBSERVED
(SPRING OF 1968)

Single Classes; N=27

	Under 20 Children	20 Children	21-25 Children	26-29 Children
Number of Classes	3	3	15	6

Floater Pattern; N=12

	26-30 Children	31-33 Children
Number of Classes	9	3

Paired Classes; N=7

	Under 30 Children	31-35 Children	36-41 Children
Number of Classes	1	4	2

Again, it is not surprising that the category just above the anticipated teacher-pupil ratio of 1/20 was largest, because the coordinator was figured into the overall ratio as previously explained. With one exception, paired second-grade class size was below the ratio of 2/40. The six entries in the single class category of 26-29 children were from schools reporting the program had not been implemented in terms of a reduced ratio, at the second-grade level, or where teachers asked to have a single class regardless of size. Classes utilizing the floater arrangement closely approximated the 1/20 ratio.

SUMMARY

In preparation for implementation of the Strengthened Early Childhood (SEC) Program, the Office of Elementary Schools sent guiding patterns of organization to district superintendents, and district ECE supervisors conducted orientation sessions for program coordinators prior to September 1967. Problems of organization were more complicated in schools with limited space. The coordinator position was filled in 23 of the 25 sample schools. Coordinators emphasized different aspects of their role. No coordinator reported assuming all of the functions of the role defined by the Planning Committee of the Board of Education. The majority of first- and second-grade teachers and principals rated coordinators as having some degree of effectiveness. Most coordinators received help from primary assistant principals, particularly at the beginning of the year. Sixteen of 24 assistant principals thought their work load was heavier this year.

District ECE supervisors were involved in varying degrees in the SEC program. Four coordinators found the district supervisor extremely helpful, seven found her slightly helpful, and 12 found her of no direct help to the school's program.

Almost half of the first-grade teachers and almost one-third of the second grade teachers in the sample schools were in their first year of teaching. The majority of the teaching positions were classroom positions. Floater, ratio, or team teachers had a rollbook class but no classroom of their own; they were assigned to help in other classes. In some schools, regular resource personnel continued to service the first and second grades, but in other schools their services were limited to grades other than grades one and two. All teachers received preparation periods, sometimes "covered" by cluster teachers, sometimes by a floater, and sometimes by the coordinator. There was limited use of paraprofessionals in the SEC program.

The predominant student ethnic group was Negro. Spanish-speaking children made up the next largest group. Children were most frequently assigned to classes according to ability or achievement.

The three designations of classroom organization were single classes with one teacher, paired classes with two teachers, and a floating teacher arrangement where an additional teacher worked in two or three classrooms on a regularly scheduled basis. The paired class organization was found more frequently in first grades than in second grades. Some schools had only paired first grade classes, some had only single classes, and others had a combination of paired, single, or floater arrangements. In all schools, specific time designations were made for instruction in different subject matter areas, particularly reading and language arts, which took the greater portion of the day.

In paired classrooms, grouping for instruction most frequently followed a pattern of each teacher working with a subgroup in reading and dividing the responsibility for instruction in most other areas. In single, reduced ratio classes, the majority of teachers had total group instruction throughout the day. The floater arrangement was implemented in a variety of ways. A floater always had responsibility for instruction in reading or other language arts in two or three classrooms. In addition, she sometimes covered preparation periods and/or worked in other curriculum areas.

Class size for single first-grade classes observed ranged from 13 to 31 children and from 23 to 37 in paired classes. Second-grade single-class size ranged from 17 to 29, paired classes from 29 to 41, and classes with floaters from 26 to 33.

CHAPTER IV

THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The program proposal emphasized reduced pupil-teacher ratio as the basic means of improving reading level. Accordingly, the size and make-up of instructional groups in reading and other language arts are central to this evaluation.

Centrally Organized Subgroups

Information on regularly scheduled subgroups and regrouping practices was sought from coordinators and assistant principals. Fifteen coordinators, in describing overall program design for a grade level, reported that regularly scheduled subgroups were set up at the first-grade level, and eleven coordinators reported similar subgroups at the second-grade level. The content of instruction in these subgroups was usually reading- or language-related, such as work with non-English speaking children. By and large, the basis for subgrouping was essentially achievement or ability. In those instances where "needs" were cited as the basis for grouping, "needs" might mean achievement, English language, or it might refer to discipline or adjustment. Also influencing subgroup structure were three mentions of such experimental programs as: i.t.a. groups in reading, the talking typewriter, and the Texas Project. There was no mention of children's interests as a basis.

Table 15 reports assistants to principals' estimates of changes in subgroup structure in their schools.

TABLE 15

CHANGES IN SUBGROUP STRUCTURE
(N=24)

Rating	No. Changes Grade 1	No. Changes Grade 2
Very frequent changes	1	1
Frequent changes	1	0
Some Changes	9	9
Infrequent changes	3	4
No changes	1	1
Don't know	6	6
No response	3	3

Changes in subgroup structure were effected mainly by changes in available personnel and their preferences among teaching assignments, as well as by the space available in the building. Some schools modified their classroom grouping arrangements during the year, resulting in either more or less auxiliary classroom space (depending on whether they increased or decreased the number of single classrooms). In other schools, more utilization was made of temporarily unoccupied classrooms and auxiliary space.

Changes in subgroup membership were determined mainly by teachers or jointly by teachers and the coordinator. Six primary assistant principals reported being involved at times in changing subgroup membership. The predominant basis for change was progress or ability of students. Other reasons for change were pupil adjustment and children's interest. Any other subgroupings that took place were not centrally scheduled; they were organized by teachers within their classrooms.

Classroom Grouping Practices: Grade 1

Observers were asked to record the number of total class group, subgroup, and individual instruction settings in reading and other language arts which occurred during each class observation. Total group instruction was defined as including all children present. Subgroup instruction was defined as ranging from two children up to less than that described for the total group; in a situation involving subgroups, there had to be other children involved in another activity. Individual instruction was defined as one adult working with one child in a conference. This did not include the incidental checking of children's work at their seats.

Grouping practices in observed first-grade classrooms are reported in Appendices A7, A8, and A9. Single and paired classes were recorded separately to permit comparisons. These data are intended only to project a gross pattern of grouping; neither size of group nor length of meeting time is included. The reader must keep in mind that the size of subgroups in paired classes was often similar to those of total groups in single classes having the reduced pupil-teacher ratio. Some subgroups were as large as 24 children, but they were, in fact, a subgrouping. Each table entry for a given class is in the same position under each category. Thus, by following the first (or third, or sixth, etc.) entry in each category for winter and spring, grouping in a given class can be seen.

During 40 whole-day and 69 half-day first-grade observations, individual instruction was observed in only 14 observations in reading and in only four observations during other language-arts instruction. In six of these observations, a single child received individual instruction. Though 19 coordinators reported that special provisions had been built into the organizational plan for individual instruction, this occurred on a very limited basis. Even when attendance was as low as eight to ten children in single classes (because of severe weather conditions), neither individual instruction nor subgroup instruction was observed. In the classrooms where 11, 12 and 17 individual conferences were held, they were conducted by the classroom teacher and the content was hearing individual children read SRA material or conferring on workbooks or worksheets.

Subgrouping occurred more in reading instruction than in other language-arts instruction. In single classes with oversized registers, somewhat more subgroup and individual instruction took place than in single classes approximating the reduced ratio. Subgrouping did occur in three of the four single classes with registers of 30 or above. (These classes were led by experienced teachers who preferred a single class to being paired.) Below is an example of that pattern.

Grade 1, Single Class   Register 33[a]   No. Children Present 27

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Setting
Group 1	A	Clrm.	All	27	Review charts	Clrm.
Group 2	A	Clrm.	Ability	7	Write directions for picture	Clrm.
Group 3	A	Clrm.	Ability	13	Word recognition	Clrm.
Group 4	A	Clrm.	Ability	7	Oral rdg.-basal	Clrm.

---

[a] This register was reduced to 31 in the spring.

In single classes with reduced registers, the dominant pattern of instruction was total group. Subgroup instruction in reading took place in five of 16 half-day observations, and in three of those five classes, a second teacher was present to conduct the second group. Only one subgroup lesson in language arts, other than specific reading skills, was reported. Below is an example of this pattern.

Grade 1, Single Class   Register 15   No. Children Present 15

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Setting
Group 1	A	Clrm.	All	15	Vocab.-basal "Friends All Around"	Clrm.
Group 2	A	Clrm.	All	15	Workbook-basal	Clrm.
Group 3	A	Clrm.	All	15	Vocab. review	Clrm.

In paired classes, the most prevalent pattern was for each teacher to work with approximately half of the children in a subgroup. There were several reports of paired teachers basing their reading group on their register (rollbook class). Flexible grouping did not occur in these classrooms. These teachers kept their "own" class for almost all instruction. Such groupings were entered as subgroups for a paired class. There was one mention of paired teachers switching reading groups each week so they could ". . . get to know all of the children." However, the teachers had some reservations about this in terms of continuity for the children.

In those entries in Appendices 8 and 9 showing more than two subgroups per observation, various arrangements were found. Sometimes each paired teacher met the same subgroup twice, but the content changed (i.e., phonics for a half-hour and basal readers for a half-hour). In other paired settings, subgroupings were across rollbook classes (e.g., composed of children from several classes), and were based on ability or need, with each teacher meeting one or more subgroups, sometimes with a third teacher working with another small group. Below is an example of this pattern during a half-day's instruction in a school where auxiliary classrooms were made available. Group 1 and 2 met simultaneously and group 3, 4, and 5 met simultaneously.

Grade 1, Paired Class   Register 37[a]   No. Children Present 29

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Setting
Group 1	A	Clrm.	Ability	20	Stern structural "We Discover Reading"	Clrm.
Group 2	B	Clrm.	Need, N.E. Lang.Ability	9	Stern structural "We Learn to Listen"	Cafeteria
Group 3	A	Clrm.	Need, Auditory, Discr.	22	Ginn Follow-up Audio	Clrm.
Group 4	B	Clrm.	Need, Visual Discr.	4	Ginn Follow-up Visual	Aux. Clrm.
Group 5[b]	C	CESL	Need,English Language	3(7)	Greetings Foods We Drink	Aux. Clrm.
Group 6	B	Clrm.	All	29	Listen to 3 Stories	Clrm.

---

[a] This register was reduced to 35 in the spring.

[b] This group was conducted by the coordinator for English as a Second Language. Seven children from another classroom joined the three children from this classroom.

In one paired class, one teacher met with small groups of two to four children, while the other teacher had a series of individual reading conferences. In those classes where a student teacher or volunteer was present, she also conducted subgroups and individual conferences.

In ten paired classes, only total group instruction in reading was observed. While one teacher was leading the group, the other teacher either watched, gave some assistance, or occasionally worked with one or two children. Below is an example of this pattern for a whole day's instruction.

Grade 1, Paired Class
Register 28
No. Children Present
A.M. 27, P.M. 25

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Setting
A.M.						
Group 1	A,B	Clrm.	All	27	Listening, Story, News	Clrm
Group 2	A,B	Clrm.	All	27	Phonics, Picture Workbooks	Clrm.
Group 3	A,B	Clrm.	All	27	Oral Reading Chart	Clrm.
P.M.						
Group 4	B,A	Clrm.	All	25	Phonics, Review	Clrm.
Group 5	B,A	Clrm.	All	25	Listening, Story Afro-Am. Folktale	Clrm.
Group 6	B,A	Clrm.	All	25	Oral Reading Chart	Clrm.
Group 7	B,A	Clrm.	All	25	Writing, copied story from chart into notebooks	Clrm.

Additional Personnel

In thirty half-day observations of single first-grade classes, there were two reports of an additional teacher present in the classroom. There were several reports of non-English speaking children, usually three or four, leaving the classroom for special instruction elsewhere. In two classes, some children left to work with the remedial reading teacher. Three classrooms had the help of either a student teacher or a volunteer.

In paired classes, 16 of the 36 classes observed had additional teaching personnel present in the classroom during reading and language-arts instruction. Sometimes the additional teacher(s) took a subgroup while the paired teachers worked with subgroups, and sometimes they worked with the total group. (This was usually the case when a cluster or speech teacher was present.) Five paired classes had the services of other adult personnel -- a student teacher, reading aide, or a volunteer.

Evidence of change in grouping procedures was found in ten paired classes where even without the benefit of additional personnel, more subgroup or individual instruction took place during the spring observations than during the winter observations.

Classroom Grouping Practices: Grade 2

Grouping practices in 46 observed single and paired second-grade classrooms are reported in Appendices A10, A11, A12, and A13. Again, these data are intended only to project gross patterns of grouping. Classes utilizing a floater or ratio teacher arrangement are tabulated as single classes. Single registers of 25 or more children are presented separately from those of less than 25 children for comparison purposes.

Examination of those Appendices reveals that of 80 half-day observations and ten whole-day observations,[1] individual instruction took place in reading during 12 observations and during three other types of language-arts instruction. Where ten and 11 individual conferences were noted per observation, the teachers were using SRA materials to work on word recognition and listening to children read. In the classroom where there were 11 individual conferences, there were also 11 small-group meetings. The entire class was divided into teams of two, using SRA materials, and the teacher or the paraprofessional met with each team. The entry of 18 individual conferences was in a classroom where the teacher and another cluster teacher who serviced two classrooms each had nine conferences. This class had an individualized reading program in the spring, and children discussed and/or read aloud from trade books during the conference. All children present had a conference.

More subgrouping took place in single classes with registers above 25 children than in single classes with registers below 25. This was attributed to the part-time presence of a floater in some of these classes. The involvement of two or more adults was noted in 25 of 40 of those half-day observations, while only 13 of 26 observations in classes with registers under 25 noted the presence of another adult. There was evidence that the number of teachers present influenced the number of subgroups, although there were exceptions. One observer summarized his description of a "team" (floater) situation as follows:

> Thus, even though there is a team of three teachers for two classrooms, the children were taught almost all morning by one teacher per class, with virtually no small grouping or individualizing.

In some floater arrangements, one floater worked with three second grades, almost exclusively in reading. Below is an example of groupings during a half day in a classroom serviced by such a floater.

---

[1] Observations of an entire day in one single class were recorded separately for A.M. and P.M.

Grade 2, Single Class with Floater   Register 27   No. Children Present 24

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Time
Group 1	A	Clrm.	All	24	Discussion, Exper. Chart	30"
Group 2	A	Clrm.	All	24	Handwriting Copying Chart	10"
Group 3	A	Clrm.	All	24	Spelling, Alphabetizing words - "My Word Book"	25"
Group 4	B	Floater	Ability	13	Vocab., oral rdg. "More Friends Old and New" Basal	45"
Group 5	A	Clrm.	Ability	11	Vocab., oral rdg. "Friends Old and New"	45"
Group 6	B	Floater	Ability	13	Writing - Vocab. words in sentences	15"
Group 7	A	Clrm.	Ability	11	(same as above)	15"

Two observers reported that a new way of organizing for reading instruction in single second grades, called streaming (actually a form of departmentalization), had been introduced between their winter and spring visits. Ability groups were formed across class registers. One observer described streaming as follows:

> In this class, four reading groups have been defined. Children in these groups join others for work with teachers (classroom and cluster), during the first 40 minutes of the school day. This teacher works with one group of average achievement. Only two children on her own register are in the group. The other children move to different rooms and teachers for reading instruction.

The instructional program in that class was reported as follows:

Grade 2, Single Class Streaming Register 20 No. Children Present 12

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Time
Group 1	A B	Clrm. Stu.T.	All	12	Spelling, homework review	5"
Group 2	A	Clrm.	All	12	Library, selecting and rdg. trade books	20"
Group 3	A B	Clrm. Stu.T.	Ability	7[a]	Vocab.-workbooks Syllabication-chalkbd. Silent Rdg.-SRA	40"
Individual	B	Stu.T.	Need	1	Sentence completion-workbook	20"

---

[a] Streaming - two from this class and five from other classes. Class convened in this classroom

The following is an example in contrast -- a large, single, second-grade class with the teacher working alone. (In this school the SEC program had not been implemented on grade-two level.) Group B was recorded as a subgroup, though the size of that group was about the same as many total class groups.

Grade 2, Single Class Register 29 No. Children Present 29

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Time
Group 1	A	Clrm.	All	29	Writing-about spring	30"
Group 2	A	Clrm.	Ability	22	Vocab., Silent/Oral rdg. "Roads to Follow" - basal	1'45"
Group 3	A	Clrm.	Ability	7	Basal - workbook	15"

(These children worked independently in a language workbook for one hour and forty-five minutes.)

In second grades with a reduced register, there was greater tendency toward total group instruction. Below is an example of this pattern during a half-day observation.

Grade 2, Single Class   Register 21   No. Children Present 15

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Time
Group 1	A	Clrm.	All	15	Phonics -- pictures and letters	30"
Group 2	A	Clrm.	All	15	Vocab. -- flashcards	20"
Group 3	A	Clrm.	All	15	Structural Analysis -- workbook	25"

In paired second grades, more subgrouping occurred with each teacher conducting one or two subgroups. Primarily, group membership was based on ability although there was one notation of class register as the basis. In about half of the paired-class settings, a third adult was present part of the time -- a student teacher, a remedial reading teacher. The following groupings occurred during a whole day's observation.

Grade 2, Paired Class Register 34 No. Children Present 30

Reading and Language Arts Observation

Reading & L.A. Groups	Tchr.	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Content	Time
A.M.						
Group 1	A,B, & C	2 Clrm. Stu.T.	All, except rem. rdg.	24	Writing-stories	20"
Group 2	D	Rem.Rdg. (in another room)	Need	6	Oral rdg., basal	45"
……						
Group 3	A	Clrm.	Ability	17	Spelling	30"
Group 4	B	Clrm.	Ability	4	Spelling	30"
Group 5	C	Stu.T.	Ability	3	Spelling	30"
……						
Group 6	A	Clrm.	Ability	15 (slowest)	Oral rdg., basal "Lands of Pleasure"	45"
Group 7	B	Clrm.	Ability	9	Vocab., oral rdg. comprehension-basal "Friends all About"	45"
Group 8	C	Stu.T.	Ability	5	Phonics-workbook, Oral rdg. - basal, "Enchanted Gates"	45"
……						
Individual	E	Partic. Stu.*	Need	1	Oral lang. & listening trade books	60"
……						
P.M.						
Group 9	A	Clrm.	Ability	25	Phonics-Merrill workbook	25"
Group 10	B	Clrm.	Ability	4	Vocab., oral rdg., basal rdr., workbook	25"
……						
Group 11	A	Clrm.	Ability	25	Discussion, weather Exper. chart	15"
Group 12	B	Clrm.	Ability	4	Experience chart	25"
Individual	B	Clrm.	Need	1	Vocab.,-workbook	5"
Individual	A	Clrm.	Need	1	Oral rdg. - workbook	15"
Individual	A	Clrm.	Need	1	Oral rdg. - workbook	10"

---

*A former participating student volunteers three hours/week to work individually with a child who has severe emotional and academic problems.

Instruction in reading and other language arts often took place in both the morning and afternoon in first- and second-grade classrooms where full-day observations were made. The time spent in these areas was approximately half, and sometimes more than half, of the school day. The following schedules, for a paired first grade and a paired second grade, represent typical time allotments for reading and other language-arts instruction during the course of a day. The manner of grouping for instruction and use of an additional room (e.g., the library), however, were not typical. These paired teachers group for instruction as follows: *total group instruction* -- science and social studies; *register group instruction* (grouping based on listings in teachers' rollbooks) -- mathematics and spelling; and, *ability group instruction* -- reading.

Grade 1, Paired Class Register 32 No. Children Present 28

Observed Daily Schedule

Clock Time	Content	Type of Instruction	Materials of Instruction	No. of Children	No. of Teachers Present	No. of Teachers Involved
9:00	Opening	Pledge, Song,	Attendance	28	2	1
9:10	L.A.	Exper. Chart,	class news	28	2	1
9:30	L.A.	Exper. Chart,	June	28	2	1
10:00	Math	Drill on 6,	Discs. Blkbd.	28	2[a]	1
10:30	Bathroom			28	1	
10:45	Reading	Familes of Words	Blackboard	28	2	1
11:15	Lunch					
12:15	Attendance			28	2	1
12:20	Reading Groups	Basal readers and workbooks		4/16/3/5	2	2
1:20	Handwriting	Copying chart		28	1[b]	1
1:50	Snack			28	1[b]	1
2:10	Listening	Story, *Curious George*		28	2	1
2:30	Recess	Playground, free play		28	2	2
2:50	Art	Drawing, crayons, paper		28	2	1

---

[a] One classroom teacher and one cluster teacher (one teacher's preparation period).

[b] Other teacher's preparation period.

Grade 2, Paired Class Register 35 No. Children Present 33

Observed Daily Schedule

Clock Time	Curric. Area	Content of Instruction	Materials of Instruction	No. of Children	No. of Teachers	
					Present	Involved
9:00	Attendance				2	2
9:10	L.A.	Exper. Chart Class news	Blackboard	33	2	1
9:15	Science	Lecture Sun & Moon	Blackboard	30	1	1
9:45	Reading	Oral rdg., word recog.	Trade books	1/1/1 (10" ea.)	1	1
9:45	Handwriting	Copying comparison chart on the sun and moon		33	2	1
10:00	Math (Group A)	Test, then drill	Flashcards	15	1	1
	Spelling[a] (Group B)	Lecture, recitation	Rules for capital letters	18	1	1
10:30	Math (Group B)	Drill adding	Blackboard	18	1	1
	Recess (Group A)	Games	Playground	15	1	1
11:15	Lunch					
12:15	Reading Groups	Vocab., oral rdg., compre.	Basal readers workbooks	22/10/5[b]	2	2
1:00	Recess (Group B)	Games	Playground	18	1	1
	Spelling	Practice words	Blackboard	15	1	1
1:30	Lang.[a] Concepts (Group A)	Discussion size-time	Calendars longer-shorter	18		
	(Group B)	Discussion	Descriptive words	15	1	1
2:00	Listening Soc. Stu.	Story	"Juanito"		2	2
2:20	Speech	Vocab. building	Games		1[c] (cluster tchr.)	1

---

[a] In library.

[b] Plus four brightest children from another class.

[c] Teachers on preparation period.

Other Classes: Reading Group Size

The Teacher Questionnaire (to teachers other than those included in the sample) included the question, "What is the average size of the group to which you give instruction in reading?" Table 16 reports responses of first- and second-grade teachers.

TABLE 16

READING GROUP SIZE REPORTED BY TEACHERS IN
OTHER SCHOOLS (QUESTIONNAIRES)
GRADE 1, N=220 GRADE 2, N=87

	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26,up
Grade 1, Single (N=66)	7	22	22	8	5	2
Grade 1, Paired (N=149)	39	42	46	18	4	0
Grade 1, Floater (N=5)	0	3	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	46	67	70	26	9	2
Grade 2, Single (N=59)	3	19	16	10	7	3
Grade 2, Paired (N=20)	0	1	4	9	5	1
Grade 2, Floater (N=9)	0	3	3	3	0	0
TOTAL	3	23	23	22	12	4

The average size of first-grade reading groups was a little less than 15 children. Second-grade reading group size tended to be larger than first-grade size.

Content and Materials of Instruction: Grades 1 and 2

Reading was taught essentially by the basal textbook-workbook approach. In addition to the traditional basal readers, the newer Bank Street Readers, highly structured phonics or linguistics programs (Stern Structural, Economy Press, Miami Linguistics), and Science Research Associates (SRA) kits were used. Some classes used basal readers from only one publisher, while others used a variety. Many classes had multi-ethnic readers and workbooks. Some classes used only basal readers while others used basal readers combined with a phonics or linguistics program, consisting of charts and workbooks; some used SRA alone, and others used the kits in combination with basal readers. In addition to one school and a few isolated classes participating in special programs, only one second grade had an individualized program using trade books after they had completed the "required" basal readers.

The curriculum and materials used in paired and single classes at each grade level were essentially of the same type. A total of 56 first-grade classes and 46 second-grade classes were observed, some for a whole day and others for a half day. Phonics, word recognition and vocabulary development, oral reading, and comprehension were based on basal or other structured textbook, workbook, or chart content. The content emphasis of 132 first-grade and 99 second-grade lessons (noted during the winter observations) is presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17

CONTENT EMPHASIS IN LESSONS OBSERVED IN READING AND OTHER LANGUAGE ARTS - WINTER OBSERVATIONS

	Grade 1		Grade 2	
Task	N=132[a]	Percent	N=99[a]	Percent
Phonics	29	22	14	14
Word Recognition	29	22	22	23
Oral Reading	23	17	16	16
Comprehension	15	11	17	17
Concept Development	5	4	4	4
Experience Charts	10	8	2	2
Listening (Literature)	10	8	9	9
Informal Diagnostic Testing	1	1	3	3
English Vocabulary	5	3.5	9	9
Other	5	3.5	3	3

[a] Refers to number of lessons observed in 56 grade-one classes and 46 grade-two classes.

The category, English Vocabulary, refers to subgroupings of non-English speaking children. Listening (also referred to as literature) related to stories, usually trade books that were read to the class by the teachers. Informal Diagnostic Testing was notably absent from the major portion of the observations. The entries in the final category, Other, were mainly a result of unclear designation of content, such as "blackboard."

The group writing of "experience" charts, or stories, took place in many classrooms, particularly first grades. If the chart was made as part of a lesson in another curriculum area, science, for example, it was recorded as science. However, if the emphasis was on reading skills rather than on chart content, it was included with reading. Chart-making was implemented in a variety of ways, but it usually was highly teacher controlled as described in the first comment below. The second comment is illustrative of good use made of children's experiences.

> One of those typical chart stories -- planned, written, and decided by the teacher. The children were observers, not participants. No attention to new vocabulary, meaning, or comprehension. The story was about the month of February, just beginning. (First grade.)
>
> Excellent! Children picked a word from a pocket chart (teacher made). They read the story, or chart, previously made up, which contained the word. Stories all about things they had in the class -- their new student teacher, etc.

Trade books were present in 53 of 56 of the classrooms, though the supply was regarded as limited in 24 of 56 first-grade rooms and in 11 of 46 second-grade rooms. Five rooms at each level had no trade (library) books. (See Appendices 14 and 15 for materials present and in use in the classrooms observed.) The books constituted classroom libraries, and they were sometimes read by children after other work was completed. In only seven classes at each grade level were trade books observed in use.

About half (29 of 56) of the first-grade classrooms had an adequate supply of reading games (word lotto, word and letter puzzles, etc.) in view in the room. In 16 first-grade classrooms the game supply was limited, and in 12 classrooms no games were in evidence. However, there was not one observation of games in use in a first-grade classroom. The game supply was more limited in second-grade classrooms, with only 11 notations of an adequate number of games and nine notations of a limited supply available. In only one second grade were games observed in use.

Teacher-made materials for use in the reading and language-arts program were in view and deemed adequate in 36 of 54 first-grade classrooms and in 33 of 46 second-grade classrooms. The bulk of such materials consisted of worksheets by teachers. However, in only nine first-grade classes and three second-grade classes was there a notation of teacher-made materials in active use.

Other materials that were observed in use in the reading and language-arts program were: For first grade -- pictures (6), tape recorder (2), record player (6), flannel board (1), puppets (6), and other materials for dramatics (4). For second grade: pictures (3), a record player (1), and a flannel board (1). In some classrooms materials were not available, and in many others much of the variety of materials in evidence was not in use.

The dominance of a structured, basal, and phonics (essentially code-breaking) approach to reading was seen in the overwhelming use of the various printed (publisher) programs. Ratings were made of appropriateness of the materials to the task of a specific lesson, and the individual needs of children making up the instructional group. Observers were not asked to judge the choice of the reading task; rather, they were asked to judge whether the materials used were appropriate to the selected task. For example, if a teacher was dealing with syllabication (or phonics, etc.), how appropriate were the materials used? Recall that the materials of instruction were mainly basal or other structured programs, and that the most frequent tasks were phonics, word recognition and vocabulary development, oral reading, and comprehension -- the tasks emphasized in those programs. Table 18 reports rating of appropriateness of materials used to the task of the lessons observed in the spring visits. (This indicates mainly how well teachers were using materials in relation to the aim or task of the lesson.)

TABLE 18

APPROPRIATENESS OF MATERIAL USED TO THE TASK
OF THE LESSON - SPRING OBSERVATIONS

	Grade 1		Grade 2	
Rating	N=155[a]	Percent	N=116[a]	Percent
Appropriate & a variety used	35	23	12	10
Appropriate, but no variety	93	60	81	70
Slightly appropriate	13	8	20	17
Not appropriate	14	9	3	3
Total	155		116	

[a] Refers to the number of lessons observed in 56 grade-one and 46 grade-two classes.

Proportionately, the collection of materials was slightly more varied among first grades, through the addition of teacher-made materials to supplement the standard basal materials. Use of combinations of materials and related activities, puzzles, games, worksheets, all directed toward the same task, were noted in the following descriptions by observers.

> Sequence cards made by the teacher were excellent materials to get non-English speaking children to speak English -- to tell a story in sequence. This is a skillful teacher. She should be working only with NE children in a single class setting with much less movement for her and the children. I'm not sure they profit as much from being with English speaking kids as they would by being segregated with this type of teacher.
>
> Before they got to the book, the teacher used a chart with the new words to be found in the story /Bank Street Readers/. Children read that. Then they went to the book. Read after a nice discussion of the major ideas of the story. Some choral reading -- others read individually. After they read, they wrote a chalkboard story to summarize the story and drew pictures containing these elements.

In 27 out of 155 lessons (17 percent) in first grade, and in 23 out of 116 (20 percent) in second grade, materials were judged only slightly appropriate or not appropriate to the task of the lesson.

A separate judgment was made as to the appropriateness of materials to the background needs of the children. Background needs referred to ethnic identity and to level of achievement. Were the materials right for the readiness level of the children and could the children identify with the characters and content? Table 19 reports these ratings.

TABLE 19

APPROPRIATENESS OF MATERIALS USED TO THE BACKGROUND NEEDS OF CHILDREN

Rating	Grade 1		Grade 2	
	N=155[a]	Percent	N=116[a]	Percent
Background needs considered, and a variety used	21	14	13	11
Background needs considered, but no variety	55	35	35	30
Background needs slightly considered	44	28	23	20
Not relevant to background needs	33	21	43	37
Don't know	2	2	2	2
Total	155		116	

[a] Refers to number of lessons observed in 56 grade-one and 46 grade-two classes.

In about half (77 out of 155 in grade one and 66 out of 116 in grade two) of the lessons, background needs were only slightly considered or the materials were judged not relevant. Although a number of classes observed did not have multi-ethnic readers, a fact which might cause such unfavorable ratings, the most frequent observer comments noted background (individual) needs not being met in relation to the high level of difficulty of materials, compared with low level of achievement of the children in the instructional group. The following observer descriptions illustrate the reason for the unfavorable ratings:

> The whole morning consisted of total class instruction with no provision for the differences which were apparent in the class. Although the teacher was "nice" to the children, it was obvious she was not aware of their needs. They all read from the basal reader at the same time after a review of the s sound. (Second Grade.)
>
> This was the top first grade and all total group instruction took place. Most of the children were beyond the first preprimer, yet all read in chorus (story chart --

> Economy Press). At least one child is on an advanced reading level, but he read with the group, too.
>
> Lesson well-developed but entirely through mass instruction. Teacher assumed 20 children were each able to learn 15 new words at one time. (Second Grade.)
>
> A fast and a slow group were combined and I wondered why, or how, they could be combined for this type of lesson. The slower group failed to recognize many of the letters and the fast group knew them all. The teachers are working in a difficult situation with a 1-2 and 1-7 class paired to create a "heterogeneous" grouping.

Some observers noted that the traditional basal content was simply not relevant to the background or interests of the children, and that it stimulated only minimal participation and no "sparks." Here is one observer's comment:

> My judgment regarding appropriateness is based not so much on the level of difficulty of the material dealt with; rather it is based on the remote, tired old subjects -- Dick and Jane. There surely could be more meaningful material developed.

The ratings reported in the tables just presented indicate that the materials teachers used tended to fit the task set for a lesson, but not the children. Background needs were not being met approximately half of the time.

Organization for Instruction in Other Curriculum Areas

During winter and spring observations, observers kept a record of instruction in science, social studies, mathematics, arts, music, and physical education. The content of lessons, grouping of children, and the number of teachers involved were noted. The same morning and afternoon classes were observed winter and spring.

Number of Lessons and Group Setting: Grade 1

Table 20 presents a summary of the instruction in curriculum areas other than reading and language arts that took place in first-grade paired classes. Mathematics instruction was the most frequently observed area, with a total of 53 lessons during the 105 half-day observations reported. Arts (31), music (28), and physical education (20), were the next most frequently occuring areas. The areas which occurred least frequently in the curriculum were science (15) and social studies (10).

Although it is possible that work related to social studies occurred during lessons that were recorded as language-arts lessons, the emphasis in those lessons was primarily on reading or language skills, rather than social science concepts.

There was a preponderance of total-class grouping in these paired classes. Of 156 lessons in curriculum areas other than reading and language arts, 132 were total-class groupings, 16 were class subgroups, and eight were groupings of more than one class. Eight of the subgroups were in mathematics (out of 53 mathematics lessons reported). Seven of eight notations of combining more than one paired class were in arts, music, or physical education.

The number of teachers present and involved, during each of the 156 lessons, split among three categories: one teacher was present during 42 lessons; two or more teachers were present, but only one was involved in instruction, in 63 lessons; and two or more teachers were present and involved in 51 lessons. The presence of only one teacher during 42 lessons reflects teachers covering for each other during preparation periods. The fact that in 63 lessons, only one of two teachers present was involved supported frequent observer reports of "taking turns" -- one paired teacher watching or working at her desk, while the other teacher assumed the responsibility for instruction in curriculum areas other than reading and other language arts. Only one-third (51 out of 156) of the time, were both teachers actively involved in instruction in other curriculum areas in paired first-grade classrooms.

The frequency of occurrence of lessons in the respective curriculum areas in single first-grade classes was similar to that found in paired first-grade classes.

Table 21 presents data on observations of 40 lessons in other curriculum areas during 24 half-day observations in single first-grade classrooms. Mathematics received the most mentions (12); next were art (9), physical education (8), and music (6). The number of science (2) and social studies (3) lessons was again the lowest.

No subgrouping took place. Thirty-eight of the lessons took place in the total class setting, and two lessons in settings of more than one class group. Only one teacher was present in 39 of the 40 lessons. The one instance of two teachers present and involved was in physical education, when two classes were together.

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION IN AREAS OTHER THAN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR ALL GRADE 1 PAIRED WINTER AND SPRING OBSERVATIONS[a]

Curriculum Area	No. Lessons Observed	No. Observation of			No. Observations of	No. Observations of	No. Observations of
		More Than One Class Group	One Total Class Group	Sub-Group	Only One Teacher Present	2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	2 or More Tchrs. Present and Involved
SCIENCE							
Winter	7	0	6	1	0	5	2
Spring	8	1	7	0	6	2	0
SOCIAL STUDIES							
Winter	7	0	7	0	2	4	1
Spring	3	0	2	1	0	1	2
MATHEMATICS							
Winter	23	0	20	3	5	10	8
Spring	30	0	25	5	5	11	14
ARTS							
Winter	14	2	11	1	6	6	2
Spring	17	0	16	1	5	7	5
MUSIC							
Winter	16	2	13	1	3	6	7
Spring	11	2	8	1	5	4	2
PHYS. EDU.							
Winter	8	1	7	0	1	3	4
Spring	12	0	10	2	4	4	4
TOTAL	156	8	132	16	42	63	51

[a] No. AM paired-class observations 44; No. PM paired class observations 61; totaling 105.

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION IN AREAS OTHER THAN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR ALL GRADE 1 SINGLE WINTER AND SPRING OBSERVATIONS[a]

Curriculum Area	No. Lessons Observed	No. Observations of: More Than One Class Group	No. Observations of: One Total Class Group	No. Observations of: Sub-Group	No. Observations of Only One Teacher Present	No. Observations of 2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	No. Observations of 2 or More Tchrs. Present and Involved
SCIENCE							
Winter	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Spring	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
SOCIAL STUDIES							
Winter	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
Spring	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
MATHEMATICS							
Winter	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
Spring	10	0	10	0	10	0	0
ARTS							
Winter	5	0	5	0	5	0	0
Spring	4	0	4	0	4	0	0
MUSIC							
Winter	3	1	2	0	4	0	0
Spring	3	0	3	0	2	0	0
PHYS. EDU.							
Winter	4	1	3	0	3	0	1
Spring	4	0	4	0	4	0	0
TOTAL	40	2	38	0	39	0	1

---

[a] No. AM single-class observations 7; No. PM single-class observations 17; totaling half-day observations 24.

Number of Lessons and Group Setting: Grade 2

Table 22 presents data on lessons in other curriculum areas in paired second-grade classes.

The predominant pattern of one paired teacher involved in instruction in other curriculum areas emerged, as it did for paired first-grade classes. Again, there were reports of paired teachers covering preparation periods for each other, and, when both were present, following the "taking turns" pattern.

Second-grade single class observations of other curriculum areas are reported in Table 23.

The relationship of number of lessons in each curriculum area to the total number of lessons was roughly the same for single second grades as it was for paired second grades. Some second grades did have paraprofessionals, and they may have inadvertently been recorded as teachers, accounting for the presence of the other six notations of more than one teacher present, or an auxiliary (i.e., speech) teacher could have been present along with the classroom teacher.

With the exception of music, the frequency of lessons in the respective curriculum areas, as they related to the total number of lessons, was much the same in first- and second-grade programs. (Music occurred more frequently in first grade than in second grade.) Mathematics was present most frequently, and social studies and science were present least frequently.

2

TABLE 23

SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION IN AREAS OTHER THAN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR ALL GRADE 2 SINGLE WINTER AND SPRING OBSERVATIONS[a]

Curriculum Areas	No. Lessons Observed	No. Observations of: More Than One Class Group	No. Observations of: One Total Class Group	No. Observations of: Sub-Group	No. Observations of Only One Teacher Present	No. Observations of 2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	No. Observations of 2 or More Tchrs. Present and Involved
SCIENCE							
Winter	4	0	4	0	4	0	0
Spring	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
SOCIAL STUDIES							
Winter	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
Spring	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
MATHEMATICS							
Winter	18	0	18	0	17	0	1
Spring	16	0	14	2	13	2	1
ARTS							
Winter	7	0	7	0	7	0	0
Spring	3	0	3	0	3	0	0
MUSIC							
Winter	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Spring	3	0	3	0	2	1	0
PHYS. EDU.							
Winter	8	2	6	0	6	1	1
Spring	9	2	7	0	7	0	2
TOTAL	75	4	69	2	66	4	5

[a] No. AM single-class observations 30; No. PM single-class observations 29; totaling half-day observations 59.

TABLE 22

SUMMARY OF INSTRUCTION IN AREAS OTHER THAN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR ALL GRADE 2 PAIRED WINTER AND SPRING OBSERVATIONS[a]

Curriculum Areas	No. Lessons Observed	No. Observations of			No. Observations of	No. Observations of	No. Observations of
		More Than One Class Group	One Total Class Group	Sub-Group	Only One Teacher Present	2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	2 or More Tchrs. Present and Involved
SCIENCE							
Winter	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Spring	4	0	4	0	2	3	0
SOCIAL STUDIES							
Winter	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Spring	2	0	2	0	1	1	0
MATHEMATICS							
Winter	12	0	8	4	1	8	3
Spring	11	0	8	3	5	4	1
ARTS							
Winter	3	0	2	1	2	0	1
Spring	4	0	4	0	4	0	0
MUSIC							
Winter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PHYS. EDU.							
Winter	3	0	3	0	3	0	0
Spring	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
TOTAL	43	0	33	10	20	18	5

---

[a] No. AM paired-class observations 14; No. PM paired-class observations 10; totaling half-day observations 24.

Content of Instruction: Grades 1 and 2

The unit approach, as a core around which investigation and learning and, thus, skills are acquired and applied, was not utilized in social studies and science. In these areas the pattern consisted generally of isolated lessons (there were some reports of a series of lessons on a topic), with few concrete, manipulative (commercial, or teacher- and/or child-made) materials utilized. The prevalent format was lecture-discussion, with some use of audiovisual materials, such as filmstrips, pictures, or a TV program. When observers reported good implementation of the basal and phonics approach in reading, where many children in a class were reading at or above grade level, they also noted that there still was virtually no application of reading -- reading to find out or for relaxation and enjoyment during the school day.

The content of instruction in mathematics was essentially practice (drill) work, although there were more concrete, manipulative materials in evidence for mathematics than for science. Concrete materials were used more by teachers for demonstration purposes than by children working at their seats. Counters of one kind or another were the most frequently used manipulative materials by children. (See Appendices A14 and A15 for materials.) Workbooks or teacher-made worksheets were used frequently. There was little evidence of the use of children's everyday experiences to show need for mathematics or for application of mathematics.

Paper, crayons, scissors, and paste were the more used materials during art periods, although painting, collage, plasticene (clay), and sewing were reported. These tended to be informal work periods. Music was usually group singing of rote songs. Listening to music, as part of specific music time, was reported twice. Use of instruments was reported several times. Physical education took place in gyms or in lunchrooms which doubled as gyms, in outside play areas, and in the classroom when health education was the topic. Sometimes games, including singing games, were organized; sometimes equipment (balls, jump ropes, etc.) was provided and free play prevailed; and sometimes children marched to music.

Three questions pertaining to paperback books were asked on the questionnaires sent to teachers in April: (1) Have you received paperback books to send home with each child? (2) If yes, how many? (3) How do you rate the quality and appropriateness of the books received? Tables 24, 25, and 26 report the responses received.

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF CLASSES RECEIVING PAPERBACK BOOKS (QUESTIONNAIRES) N=299[a]

Classroom Setting		Yes	Nc
Grade 1, Single	N= 66	50	16
Grade 1, Paired	N=154	121	33
Grade 2, Single	N= 59	47	12
Grade 2, Paired	N= 20	16	4
Totals	299	234	65

[a] Nine questionnaires from grade 2 floater teachers are excluded from this tabulation.

TABLE 25

NUMBER OF PAPERBACK BOOKS RECEIVED PER CHILD (QUESTIONNAIRES) N=234

		Number of Books Per Child						No Response
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Grade 1, Single	N= 50	9	14	22	3	0	0	2
Grade 1, Paired	N=121	28	40	42	6	2	0	3
Grade 2, Single	N= 47	6	18	18	3	0	1	1
Grade 2, Paired	N= 16	3	2	6	4	1	0	0
Totals	234	46	74	88	16	3	1	6

TABLE 26

QUALITY AND APPROPRIATENESS OF BOOKS RECEIVED[a]
N=234

Rating	Grade 1 Single	Grade 1 Paired	Grade 2 Single	Grade 2 Paired	Total
Excellent	12	20	13	2	47
Very good	15	45	9	5	74
Good	17	32	20	4	73
Fair	5	20	5	2	32
Poor	6	14	4	2	26
No response	14	25	9	4	52

[a] Where totals do not equal the number of teachers responding, teachers made more than one response.

Not all of the classes of teachers responding had received paperback books by April. Of those classes receiving books, the majority received two or three books per child. The number of ratings of good to excellent was 194 and the number of ratings of fair-poor was 58.

Questions regarding the enrichment of materials for reading readiness or formal reading were not included, because teachers had no way of knowing which materials they received came from the additional money appropriated. Also, because of the vast number of inexperienced teachers, who had no basis for comparison, questions asking for the amount of instructional material received this year as compared with last year were not included.

The 23 coordinators in the sample were asked questions regarding the provision and effectiveness of materials. Responses to the question, "How adequate have the provisions been of materials and equipment in your program?" were as follows: more than adequate (7); adequate (10); less than adequate (6). A sample of comments by coordinators follows:

> Materials have been ordered, but haven't been received yet . . . Pleased to be able to order. Those that have been received are used effectively.

> Material available and used. Teachers catch enthusiasm for materials from each other and become competitive in their use.
>
> A.V. materials stolen recently. Materials available are not greatly used by teachers. Reading materials are well used. Social studies materials are available and used for language development.
>
> Multi-racial books, toys, puzzles, etc., are here, but not as many as you would like, especially A.V. and social studies material.

Responses to the question, "How effective do you think these materials and equipment are? (consider availability, frequency of use, quality, and variety)," were as follows: very effective (11); moderately effective (5); slightly effective (3); ineffective (2) and no response (2). The responses in the three categories other than "very effective" support observations of lack of use of a variety of materials; the following observer comment is representative:

> Instruction lacks a creative dimension. The curriculum is all reading for reading's sake. Some diversity of activity would help. The children spend the greater part of their day reading orally from text and workbooks and reciting orally as directed by the teacher. They sorely need instructional activities and expansion of their curriculum.

If "enrichment materials" is interpreted to mean materials other than text and workbook materials, they were either not available or not in use in most of the programs observed.

SUMMARY

Centrally scheduled subgroups were set up in fifteen first-grade programs and eleven second-grade programs. The basis for subgrouping was essentially achievement or ability.

Classroom grouping practices for reading and other language-arts instruction tended to relate to the number of teachers present in a classroom, although there was evidence of some subgrouping in single-teacher classrooms (mainly those with high registers), and total-class grouping in some paired-class settings, mainly at first-grade level. The average size of reading groups was around fifteen children.

Reading and other language-arts instruction took up half, or more, of the school day. The content of these lessons was almost exclusively basal or other structured text programs. Other materials than text materials were present in many classrooms, but not often found in use. The materials used were more often found appropriate to the task of a lesson than they were to the background needs (both in terms of learning readiness and ethnic identity) of the children in the instructional groups.

The amount of instruction in other curriculum areas occurred, roughly, in the following descending order for both first and second grade: mathematics, art, physical education, music, social studies, and science. Total-group instruction by an individual teacher was the dominant pattern, with some subgrouping noted for mathematics instruction. In most paired classrooms, the two teachers alternated responsibilities for teaching in these areas, again with the occasional exception of mathematics.

Out of 298 first- and second-grade classrooms, 234 received paperback books and 64 did not. Of those receiving books, the majority reported receiving two or three books per child. A large majority (194) of the teachers responding rated the books received as appropriate; there were 58 ratings of fair to poor. A variety of enrichment materials was not found in use in the classrooms observed.

CHAPTER V

SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND OBSERVER PERCEPTIONS

Perceptions of School Personnel

District ECE supervisors, principals, coordinators, and a broad sample of first and second grade teachers were asked their perceptions of the program. Tables 27 and 28 present their reactions to the first- and second-grade programs in their schools, or districts (ECE supervisors).

TABLE 27

SCHOOL PERSONNEL REACTIONS TO THE FIRST GRADE PROGRAM

	ECE Supervisors		Principals		Coordinators		Single Teachers		Paired Teachers	
Rating	N=16	Per-cent	N=25	Per-cent	N=25[a]	Per-cent	N=66	Per-cent	N=154	Per-cent
Completely positive	1	6	7	28	3	12	13	20	8	5
Strongly positive, but not completely	12	75	11	44	12	48	27	41	64	42
Slightly positive	3	19	4	16	4	16	17	26	45	29
Slightly negative	0		2	8	3	12	6	9	11	8
Strongly negative, but not completely	0		1	4	1	4	2	3	16	10
Completely negative	0		0		2	8	1	1	10	6

[a] Includes 23 assigned coordinators and two assistants to principal who were also filling role of coordinator.

TABLE 28

SCHOOL PERSONNEL REACTIONS TO THE SECOND GRADE PROGRAM

Rating	ECE Supervisors N=16	ECE Supervisors Per-cent	Principals N=25	Principals Per-cent	Coordinators N=25[a]	Coordinators Per-cent	Single Teachers N=59	Single Teachers Per-cent	Paired Teachers N=20	Paired Teachers Per-cent
Completely positive	0		6	24	5	20	7	12	0	
Strongly positive, but not completely	7	44	12	48	9	36	29	48	8	40
Slightly positive	5	31	4	16	5	20	17	29	3	15
Slightly negative	2	12.5	3	12	1	4	1	2	1	5
Strongly negative, but not completely	2	12.5	0		1	4	3	5	6	3
Completely negative	0		0		2	8	1	2	2	10
No response	0		0		2[b]	8	1	2	0	

[a] Includes 23 coordinators and two assistants to principal who were filling this role as well.

[b] Two coordinators did not respond because the program was not implemented in second grades.

A large majority of the respondents (231 out of 286 for first grade and 117 out of 145 for second grade) had varying degrees of positive feeling about the program. Proportionately, paired teachers indicated more reserved positive feelings.

Tables 29 and 30 indicate personnel recommendations about the continuation of the first-and second-grade SEC programs.

TABLE 29

SCHOOL PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT CONTINUATION OF THE FIRST GRADE PROGRAM

	ECE Supervisors		Principals		Coordinators		Single Teachers		Paired Teachers	
Rating	N=16	Per-cent	N=25	Per-cent	N=25	Per-cent	N=66	Per-cent	N=154	Per-cent
Continue as now organized	4	25	7	28	7	28	23	35	19	12
Continue, but modify	12	75	16	64	15	60	36	55	103	67
Discontinue	0		2	8	3	12	6	9	25	16
Undecided	0		0		0		1	1	7	5

TABLE 30

SCHOOL PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT CONTINUATION OF THE SECOND GRADE PROGRAM

	ECE Supervisors		Principals		Coordinators		Single Teachers		Paired Teachers	
Rating	N=16	Per-cent	N=25	Per-cent	N=25	Per-cent	N=59	Per-cent	N=20	Per-cent
Continue as now organized	3	19	8	32	10	40	17	29	2	10
Continue,but modify	13	81	16	64	9	36	37	62	12	60
Discontinue	0		1	4	3	12	1	2	6	30
Undecided	0		0		1	4	3	5	0	
No response	0		0		2	8	1	2	0	

Most respondents thought the program should be continued, but with modifications. Proportionately, fewer paired teachers favored continuation of the program. Examination of responses to questions that asked for problems resolved and unresolved, and recommendations for improvement of the program gave an indication of kinds of modifications respondents had in mind. Table 31 presents the major areas of stated resolved and unresolved problems and frequency of mentions. (See Appendix A16 for a list of subcategories that comprised the major categories, and Appendix A17 for the frequency of mentions by each personnel group.)

TABLE 31

SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS RESOLVED AND UNRESOLVED

Problems	Grade 1[a] Resolved	Grade 1[a] Unresolved	Grade 2[b] Resolved	Grade 2[b] Unresolved
Overall Program Organization	107	202	77	78
Instructional Groupings	106	43	47	24
Individualizing Instruction	94	5	54	14
Professional Growth of Teachers	78	51	18	14
Instructional Program	51	54	42	34
Pupil Progress	25	37	9	11
Teacher-Pupil Relations	24	0	12	0
Materials and Equipment	16	41	6	18
Parent-Community Relations	8	21	4	5
Space	0	74	0	30

[a] Responses were contributed by 286 respondents, total body of personnel included in Table 29.

[b] Responses were contributed by 145 respondents, total body of personnel included in Table 30.

It was not surprising that, in the first year of a new program, many problems related to overall program organization and instructional groupings. Organization was reflected, indirectly, in other categories when a cause-effect relationship was mentioned such as greater pupil growth in reading because of smaller instructional groupings, or fragmentation of the instructional program because of pairing.

In the category, Overall Program Organization, a concentration of responses related to the pairing of teachers (46 resolved; 99 unresolved) by both supervisory personnel and teachers. Where problems in pairing were reported as resolved, respondents cited better interpersonal relations, though there were mentions of "minimal" and "resigned." Personality clashes, conflicting teaching styles, and "...two teachers of equal authority in the same room," were cited as unresolved problems related to pairing.

Another concentration of responses, contributed by both supervisory staff and teachers, pertained to provisions for dealing with discipline problems and children with special learning needs because of inability to maintain control (22 resolved; 48 unresolved). Where this problem was resolved, reference was made to greater control because of two teachers in the classroom. Where these problems remained unresolved, the lack of provision for additional special services in the overall program organization was most frequently cited.

In the category, Instructional Groupings, the problems resolved referred mainly to the smaller size of instructional groups; problems unresolved referred mainly to large class size and, to a lesser degree, to heterogeneous groups where there was a wide range of ability within the class.

Problems resolved in the category, Individualizing Instruction, centered on teachers' perceptions that they were able to give more individual attention to children. There were more supervisors who cited need for more individualization as an unresolved problem than teachers; some teachers mentioned not meeting the individual needs of slower and faster children.

Problems resolved in the category, Professional Growth, centered on more sharing and cooperation among teachers, and growth as a result of pairing experienced and inexperienced teachers. Unresolved problems were contributed mainly by supervisory staff who cited ineffective teaching, teacher absenteeism, and personality clashes in paired classes; teachers cited lack of helpful supervision.

In the category, Instructional Program, problems resolved centered on the reading program. Unresolved problems related mainly to additional staff needs. In the perception of supervisors and teachers alike, the instructional program suffered because specialists and/or special classes were not available for helping very slow readers, retarded children, or disturbed and "disruptive" children. A weakened instructional program, caused by split sessions, was reported as an unresolved problem by 16 teachers. (Two principals cited split sessions as having resolved an overall organizational problem.)

In the category, Pupil Progress, problems resolved centered on children's achievement in reading. Unresolved problems centered on the inability of children to adjust to changing teachers in paired settings, and on time wasted during coverage of teacher preparation periods. Also, progress was sometimes noted as limited because of late admissions, absence, and transient student population.

Only resolved problems were mentioned in the category, Teacher-Pupil Relations. "Better relations with children," was the main response; this was attributed to smaller class size and getting to know children better.

There were more respondents who reported unresolved problems related to Materials and Equipment than did those who reported resolved problems. Where problems were resolved, respondents cited more materials available and one person reported the establishment of a resource materials center. The unresolved problems centered on lack of quantity and variety of materials, insufficient provisions for circulation of materials, and bolted down desks.

Problems pertaining to Parent-Community Relations were most often left unresolved. The problem most frequently cited was difficulty in getting parents involved. Problems resolved usually referred to more efforts to inform parents, but there was limited success in involving parents, in the educational process.

No problems of Space were mentioned as resolved, other than arriving at schedules to utilize available space during regular daily sessions, or going to split sessions, which were categorized in overall program organization. Supervisory and teaching personnel alike cited crowded classrooms in paired classes, lack of space for small-group work, and the inability to reduce all class ratios, due to lack of classroom space.

Recommendations

The frequency of mentions in the various areas of recommendations indicated the major areas of concern. The recommendations dealt primarily with organizational arrangements related to class size, deployment of teaching personnel among regular and special classes, instructional groupings, and scheduled planning time. Table 32 summarizes school personnel recommendations. (For detailed breakdown of Table 32 see Appendix A18.)

TABLE 32

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS N=362[a]

Subject of Recommendations	Frequency of Mentions
Class Size and Organization	184
Special Services and Staff	152
Teacher Involvement in Training and Planning for Instruction	122
Instructional Groupings	66
Materials and Equipment	65
Space	64
Parent-Community Relations	38
The Coordinator	29
Instructional Program	21

[a] Represents all grade 1 and 2 teachers, principals, coordinators, and ECP supervisors who were interviewed and/or responded to questionnaires.

Of the 184 recommendations in the category, Class Size and Organization, 124 respondents specifically recommended single classes with reduced registers of 1/15 or 1/20. General reduction of class size received 20 recommendations, and 40 recommendations related to accommodations for paired classes, such as giving teachers a choice of partners. (See Appendix A18.) Teacher preferences for classroom setting are presented in Table 33.

TABLE 33

CLASSROOM SETTING PREFERRED

Classroom Setting Preferred	Grade 1 Single Teachers	Paired Teachers
	N=66	N=154
Paired Class, 30 Children	1	29
Single Class, 15 Children	64	119
Other	1	6
	Grade 2	
	N=59	N=20
Paired Class, 40 Children	0	3
Single Class, 20 Children	56	14
Other	3	3

The 64 recommendations in the category, Space, called for the provision of more overall and small-group space. Another collection of recommendations, not unrelated to space, were grouped to form the category, Special Services and Staff. These recommendations voiced need for specialists in the teaching of English as a foreign language, reading, and psychological services. There were a few recommendations for art and music cluster teachers trained in those areas. There were recommendations, too, for paraprofessionals to serve as classroom assistants, and for family assistants, who would serve as liaison between home and school. The proportion of supervisor recommendations in this category was greater than teacher recommendations. Supervisors were concerned with the addition of special teaching staff, their recruitment, selection, and assignment. Classroom teachers were concerned with their inability to cope with the special needs of all children and with disruption of instruction in the classroom.

The need for more attention to the instruction of non-English speaking children was cited by all. Some of the recommendations called for setting up special classroom groups and others for regularly scheduled intensive study subgroupings. Lack of provision in overall organization for discipline problems and the "disruptive child" was repeatedly cited and recommendations were made for setting up special, smaller classes for these children, for Junior Guidance classes, for more help from guidance counselors, and, generally, for increased services from the Bureau of Child Guidance. The help of special reading teachers to work in and out of the classroom was the third area of concern within the recommendations for additional professional services.

Greater use of paraprofessionals received fewer mentions (roughly, one-third as compared with two-thirds); when paraprofessionals were recommended, it was more often for classroom work than home-related work. Some teachers recommended reduced ratios and an allotment of a paraprofessional, preferring the services of a paraprofessional, ". . . whom I can train according to my teaching style," to being paired with another teacher.

The need for modification of the instructional program was reflected in recommendations for additional specialized staff and services. Thus, the category, Instructional Program, is a small one and contains recommendations for curriculum content, such as more experimentation, more trips, and more attention to evaluation of pupil progress.

Concern for the instructional program was also reflected in recommendations categorized under the heading, Teacher Involvement in Training and Planning. Recommendations by supervisors constituted 64 of the 122 recommendations in this category; these referred mainly to making provisions for inservice teacher training, and also to providing time for cooperative teacher planning. Teacher recommendations centered on the need for helpful supervision and the provision of scheduled time for cooperative planning.

Thirty-two recommendations made by both supervisors and teachers reflected problems centered on "coverage" for preparation periods and called for a reevaluation, or better system for organizing preparation period coverage. It was very difficult to decide where to categorize the various recommendations concerning preparation periods, because they related to overall program and class organization, staff specialists (cluster teachers who cover preparation periods are often resource teachers with assigned specialities), to the instructional program, as well as to planning for instruction. Since preparation periods were established to provide time for teacher planning, it was decided to categorize specific recommendations related to preparation periods and cooperative planning here, and other related recommendations in the categories just referred to. Examples of specific recommendations were: (1) scheduling preparation periods late in the day, at the same time daily, at a time when planning could be done with other teachers; (2) not using ratio (floater) teachers or the coordinator for coverage; and (3) relating content taught during "coverage" to the curriculum of the classroom. There were additional recommendations related to preparation periods that had to be categorized elsewhere.

Recommendations for training teachers to become more effective reflected needs cited by both supervisors and teachers. The areas of recommendations were as follows:

1. orientation for new teachers;
2. orientation for all teachers when a new program is implemented;
3. workshops where new materials and their use are demonstrated, as well as methodology for dealing with curriculum content (particularly reading and mathematics) and control;
4. classroom demonstrations by the coordinator and other master teachers, as well as provision for interclass visitations;
5. continuous opportunities for cooperative planning by teachers (among the team of teachers responsible for instructing a given group of children, and among all teachers on a grade level) to explore and plan curriculum content, classroom management, flexible grouping procedures, specific teaching responsibilities, assumed by different teachers in relation to a topic or overall curriculum content, and guidelines for evaluating pupil progress.

Recommendations for cooperative planning and a better system of dealing with preparation periods were not unrelated; such recommendations as ". . . freedom from interruptions," and ". . . relate cluster teaching to enrich and complement other classroom activities," were made by teachers. Specific recommendations by two ECE supervisors follows:

> A team of three teachers should service two classes. The additional teacher should give preparation periods and work with small groups for remedial work. This would maintain continuity for the children and minimize the movement of classes.
>
> The trend toward smaller registers and more individual work with children on their own level is a very good one. The positive values of this program in that area should be maintained. However, teachers have varying teaching styles, and the effective use of each teacher in the team can be effected through training. If the program is to continue in its present form, time should be arranged for workshops.

About half (30 out of 66) of the recommendations in the category, Instructional Groupings, called for homogeneously based groupings, either classrooms or subgroupings. Only three recommendations were for more heterogeneous groupings, three for more small group instruction, and five for more multiclass activities, or large groupings. Fifteen recommendations cited the need for more flexible groupings and schedules and for more experimentation with grouping. Five recommendations called for grouping in a way that would require less movement and confusion.

Of the 65 recommendations in the category, Materials and Equipment, 34 listed making available additional and more varied materials. Audio-visual materials and trade (library) books were most frequently mentioned. Fourteen recommendations were for the establishment of a school resource center where materials could be displayed and selected. Eight recommendations called for use of the school library by first- and second-grade children.

In the category, Coordinator, most recommendations called for more demonstrations. Two ECE supervisors recommended further training of coordinators and one teacher recommended that teachers help set guidelines for the role of coordinator. Proportionately, more ECE supervisors made recommendations in this category. One of their comments follows:

> Regardless of program modifications next year, the position of early childhood coordinator should be maintained. Without their [coordinators'] efforts, this program would not have succeeded.

Recommendations in the category, Parent-Community Relations, dealt with getting more parent involvement, generally.

Parent Involvement

Teachers were asked how parents were oriented to the SEC program, what efforts were made by the school to inform and involve parents, and how effective the school was in involving parents. Only first-grade teacher responses were reported in Table 34.

TABLE 34

ORIENTATION OF PARENTS TO THE SEC PROGRAM (AS INDICATED
BY RESPONSES OF FIRST GRADE TEACHERS)
N=220[a]

Activity	Number of Mentions
Meeting of all grade 1 parents in the fall	66
Joint meeting of all grade 1 and 2 parents	17
Letters sent home explaining the program	46
Other	24
No parent orientation	73

[a] Total is higher than base N of 220 because some teachers checked two categories.

Efforts to inform and involve parents took place mainly in large-group settings, except for parent-teacher conferences to report pupil progress. Kinds of activities, and the number of times they were mentioned follow: large-group meetings (120), parent conferences (84), P.T.A. activities (58), mailings (49), open house (41), and parents attending special classroom projects (27). There were one or two mentions of English classes for parents, a course in new mathematics, a family room in the school, coffee with the principal, parent representation at weekly coordination meetings, and special reading projects. Table 35 reports teacher ratings of the effectiveness of the school in informing and involving parents.

TABLE 35

EFFECTIVENESS OF EFFORTS FOR PARENT-SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT

Rating	Grade 1 Teachers N=220	Percent	Grade 2 Teachers N=79	Percent
Very effective	13	6	2	3
Effective	56	25	12	15
Slightly effective	65	30	29	37
Slightly ineffective	24	11	14	18
Ineffective	54	25	16	20
No response	8	3	6	7

The feeling, generally, was that the school attempted to inform parents of the educational process, but that the problem of involving parents remained "difficult."

Principals and coordinators suggested workshops most frequently as a means of achieving greater involvement of parents in understanding the educational process in the school and in taking a more active role in helping their children. Some respondents stressed the importance of keeping groups small and having more direct personal contacts. Workshops should display instructional materials and demonstrate their use, show Board of Education films and suggest activities to carry out at home. The distribution of handbooks or manuals on how to help children at home, together with explanations of how to use the handbooks was another frequently mentioned suggestion. Coordinators suggested (1) holding meetings during school time; (2) the establishment of Mothers' Clubs to help with classroom activities; (3) encouraging more class visitation, along with special invitations to join school functions; and (4) the use of family assistants, nights and weekends, to visit parents.

Summary of Teacher Perceptions of the SEC Program

Teachers were asked how effective they thought the SEC program was in meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading. Table 36 reports their perceptions.

TABLE 36

EFFECT OF THE SEC PROGRAM ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM IN READING

	Grade 1 Teachers				Grade 2 Teachers				Total	
	Single		Paired		Single		Paired			
	N=66	Per-cent	N=154	Per-cent	N=59	Per-cent	N=20	Per-cent	N=299	Per-cent
Very effective	15	23	39	25	11	19	2	10	67	21
Effective	27	41	61	40	29	48	8	40	125	42
Slightly effective	22	3	41	27	13	23	6	30	82	29
Slightly ineffective	0		3	2	1	2	0		4	1
Ineffective	1	1	9	6	4	6	4	20	18	6
No response	1	1	1		1	2	0		3	1

Because the greatest program modification was at first-grade level, only first-grade teachers were asked to specify assets, liabilities, positive results, and negative consequences on checklists that were presented in the Teachers Questionnaire. (See Appendices A19, A20, A21, and A22 for complete listings.)

The three greatest assets of the SEC program cited, in descending order of frequency, were as follows:

Paired First-Grade Teachers	Single First-Grade Teachers
Opportunity to teach small groups in reading	A single class of 15 children
Flexible groups within the classroom based on the needs of children and the special abilities of teachers	Opportunity to teach small groups in reading
Opportunity for teaching individual children	Opportunity for teaching individual children

The three most severe limitations of the SEC program, listed in descending order of frequency, were as follows:

Paired First-Grade Teachers	Single First-Grade Teachers
Not enough space within the classroom for paired groups	Not enough parent contact to foster understanding of the educational program
Not enough space for small-group instruction outside the classroom	Pairing of teachers in one classroom
Pairing of teachers in one classroom, and not enough parent contact to foster understanding of the educational program	Not enough space for small-group instruction outside the classroom

The three most positive results of the SEC program, as perceived by first-grade teachers, were as follows:

Paired First-Grade Teachers	Single First-Grade Teachers
Greater achievement of children in learning to read	Greater teacher knowledge of individual children's needs, problems, and growth
Greater teacher knowledge of individual children's needs, problems, and growth	Greater achievement of children in learning to read
Teacher's professional growth because of close working relationship with another teacher in the same classroom	Greater achievement of children in other fundamental skills

The three most negative consequences of the SEC program, as perceived by first-grade teachers, were as follows:

Paired First-Grade Teachers	Single First-Grade Teachers
Rapport problems among paired teachers	Parents not involved or interested in the educational process
Parents not involved or interested in the educational process	Rapport problems among paired teachers
Lack of integration among content areas due to the number of different teachers in various subject areas, and children being confused by having to work with several teachers	Children confused by having to work with several teachers

Perceptions of Observers

Each of the nine observer-interviewers had a background of work experience in the elementary school before becoming college instructors in teacher education programs. Each was a specialist in elementary curriculum and teaching. They observed both experienced and first-year teachers. Their recommendations about the continuation of the program are presented in Table 37.

TABLE 37

OBSERVER RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT CONTINUATION
OF THE PROGRAM
N=9

Recommendation	Grade 1	Grade 2
Continue as now organized	0	2
Continue, but modify organization	8	5
Discontinue	1	2

The observer who favored discontinuing the program at both grade levels stated:

> According to my observations, the paired or team arrangement does not provide educational benefits in organization, curriculum, use of materials, etc. The money spent for pairing could be used to (1) reduce actual class size and (2) provide teaching assistants or paraprofessionals for teachers.

An observer who favored continuing the second-grade program as now organized stated the following:

> A 1/20 ratio is a liveable situation, especially with help from a cluster teacher or reading assistants during reading periods.

Obviously, these observers saw different implementations of the program -- different class sizes and organizational plans. The observer who favored discontinuing the first- and second-grade programs saw teamed (2 classrooms/3 teachers), or paired settings, while the observer who favored continuing the second-grade program as presently organized cited reduced-ratio single classes in which the classroom teacher had assistance, as well. Implementation of both the first- and second-grade programs varied in the sample schools and depended to a large degree on space available in relation to the size of the student population.

Recommendations for Program Modifications

Class size and organizing classes. Five of the nine observers recommended the elimination of two teachers per classroom in first-grade classes, and keeping registers as low as building space would permit. Three of those five observers recommended use of paraprofessionals in each room (coupled with a training program for paraprofessionals), and two recommended use of additional teachers for small group and individual work part of the day in each classroom.

The remaining four observers recommended not pairing routinely, but taking into account other considerations -- size of classroom, teachers' preferences, and children's needs (small single classes for the least mature children, for children most lacking in facility with English language, and for children with control problems). When classes are paired, they recommended considering the wishes of teachers, their strengths, weaknesses, and experience. Also, the idea of two classes, "mine" and "yours," should be eliminated if possible by having only one rollbook or register for each paired class.

Following are three recommendations for overall program organization:

> Group children heterogeneously in classes of 15 to 20 children in order to make grouped and individualized instruction a necessity, or
>
> Create teacher teams on each grade level. A three-to-six teacher team might be comprised of the positions, tutor, lab instructor, and group instructor. Tutors would work with individual children in basic skill development. Lab instructors would work with small groups of children in language arts, science, and math in classrooms outfitted as curriculum resource centers. Group instructors would work with groups as large as 20 in various curriculum areas. Team teachers would cooperatively diagnose and evaluate pupil progress and plan for the integration of curriculum areas and instructional activities. Pupil and team teacher schedules would be arranged so that teachers from within the team would be instructing children during individual teacher planning periods.
>
> . . . try a variety of patterns suggested by teachers and let them help in the evaluation:

1. 1/15 ratio in classes of the lowest exponent "slowest group," serviced each day by a reading specialist;

2. 1/25 ratio in classes of the brightest children, serviced each day by a reading specialist; and

3. 2/30 ratio in master-apprentice team teaching situations with space for out-of-class small-group instruction.

Most observers recommended the elimination of paired second-grade classes in favor of as low a register as space permits and either the use of paraprofessionals and/or additional teachers for help in reading and language-arts instruction, or one of the arrangements described above.

Individualizing instruction and grouping. Four observers recommended more subgrouping and individualizing throughout the curriculum if the background needs of children are to be met.

Materials. Four recommendations related to materials; two called for faster delivery of materials, one for the establishment of curriculum resource centers in schools, and one for making available a greater variety of materials.

Planning for instruction. Observers often used the "Additional Comments" section of the Classroom Observation Guide to address themselves to the practice of "coverage" for teacher preparation (planning) periods with such comments as ". . . chaos whenever the cluster teacher comes in" . . . "time wasted". . . "no relation to the rest of the day". . . "fragments the curriculum". . . "too much mediocre art and music" prevailed. One positive observation was, "Mrs. X, a cluster teacher, appears to be very competent, unusually well prepared and has many materials."

The first comment below described a class during "coverage" and that observer's reaction, and the second states a strong, but representative reaction to "coverage."

> The preparation period was in the middle of the afternoon. The gym teacher didn't seem to be really prepared (teacher said he had grabbed a book on rainy days from the library). In short, with a preparation period during the prime part of the afternoon, key learning time was "filled" instead of utilized advantageously.
>
> The concept of "covering" a class has no place in education. In my estimation, it constitutes malpractice. Busy work is designed for the children which they do not take seriously. Little, if any, cooperative planning

> between cluster and classroom teacher appears to attend class coverage. All in all, the way in which preparation periods are developed further compounds problems of instructional sterility, irrelevance, and inefficiency.

Observers' concern about "coverage" was also a concern of supervisors and teachers who called for a reevaluation of the system used for dealing with preparation periods. Related to this problem were recommendations for the provision of time for joint planning by teachers who instruct a given group of children and for organizational plans that would build individual teacher planning periods into schedules for a team approach. There were recommendations, too, for grade-level meetings to pool ideas and share materials.

Teacher training. There were 13 observer recommendations for various kinds of inservice training. Though none of the observation instruments called for judgments of teacher competency, observers cited the need for improvement of basic teaching skills in subject areas, in classroom management practices, in planning for instruction, and the use of a more varied collection of instructional materials. The following recommendations are representative:

> Provide good inservice work. Teachers need strong instruction in the methods and materials of teaching reading.
>
> Have a teacher trainer work with teachers emphasizing: methods of ability grouping in a classroom, techniques of long range planning and integration of subject matter areas, and understanding of the reading process.
>
> Build inservice education into the program. . . include study of the dynamics of teaching, procedures for diagnosis of children's learning needs and problems, unit planning and implementation, methods and materials for individualizing instruction, and ideas for activity-oriented curricula.
>
> Teachers I observed now know how to teach phonics and sight vocabulary. (They) now need to be prepared to help children use reading as a tool for living and learning. Language arts in school should comprise more than a series of reading periods from basal readers.

Content recommended for inservice workshops included role expectancy in a team effort, direction in gaining more flexibility in grouping for reading, grouping in areas other than reading, organizing for more individualization of instruction, methods and materials of teaching reading, unit planning, applying reading -- reading to learn, long range and cooperative planning, diagnosis of reading problems, and guidelines for evaluating pupil progress. The point was made that organizational maneuvering will not, in and of itself, improve the quality of instruction and provision must be made for inservice help for teachers and coordinators, as well.

Coordinator. Some of the foregoing recommendations for giving help to teachers were made in conjunction with the role of coordinator. Recommendations for role emphasis for the coordinator included more demonstration teaching, dissemination of new methods and materials, and for exercising greater leadership in helping teachers plan for instruction and in setting up instructional subgroups within the classroom. Three recommendations called for more supervisory help for the coordinator. Two recommended a closer working relationship between the district ECE supervisor and school coordinators and for district conferences to help coordinators gain new ideas, evaluate their implementation of the role, and learn how to help foster positive human relations. One observer recommended more interest and help on the part of inschool supervisors for coordinators. There was one recommendation for a separate coordinator for second grade.

SUMMARY

School Personnel Perceptions and Recommendations

A majority of the school personnel who responded to questionnaires had varying degrees of positive feeling about the SEC program. The majority also felt the program should be continued, but with organizational modifications. The resolved-unresolved problem category receiving the greatest number of mentions was Overall Program Organization, with pairing of teachers referred to most frequently. Provision within the overall organization for handling discipline problems and caring for children with special learning needs was next in frequency of mention.

The three largest categories of recommendations were Class Size and Organization, Special Services and Staff, and Teacher Involvement in Training and Planning for Instruction. A majority of the respondents recommended single classes with reduced registers. The three most frequently recommended special services were teachers of English as a foreign language, reading teachers, and psychological services. Provisions for inservice teacher training, time for cooperative planning by all teachers working with a group of children, and a reevaluation of the system for organizing preparation period "coverage" received a concentration of recommendations.

Though some school personnel felt parent-school communication had become more effective, most felt effective involvement of parents continued to be "difficult" to obtain.

A majority perceived the SEC Program as having had some degree of positive effect on the instructional program in reading. Greatest assets of the program, as perceived by first-grade teachers, were: the opportunity to teach small groups in reading and a single class of 15 children. The most severe limitations designated were: not enough space within the classroom for paired classes and not enough parent contact to foster understanding of the educational program. The most positive results were designated as: greater achievement of children in learning to read and greater teacher knowledge of individual children's needs, problems and growth. The most negative consequences were: rapport problems among paired teachers, and parents not becoming involved or interested in the educational process.

Observer Perceptions and Recommendations

Eight of the nine observers recommended continuing reduced ratios, but with organizational modifications. Modifications centered on redeployment of the teaching staff in a way that would eliminate "coverage" as it is now practiced and create teaching teams with each teacher having specific teaching, or teaching-training-organizing responsibilities, for a given number of children. Other organizational modifications recommended were: (1) single classes serviced by paraprofessionals and/or additional teachers for English language and reading for part of the day, and (2) combinations of single and paired classes of differing size and make-up, depending on size of rooms, needs of children, and teachers' preferences, along with flexible ability subgrouping -- in other words, an organizational framework planned by supervisory and teaching staff that meets the needs of a specific school population and takes into consideration best utilization of available space and teaching personnel, with each staff member assuming well-defined responsibilities in planning and teaching. The aim of the organizational modifications was a strengthening of the instructional program by providing a desirable and active planning and teaching role for all teaching personnel throughout the day, and for helpful supervision.

Observers felt the coordinators should be maintained, their role more clearly delineated, and supervisory help provided by them. Recommended emphases for the coordinator's role were demonstration teaching, providing help in the use of varied materials and methodology, guiding teachers' planning and organizing for instruction, and helping with human relations -- in short, an active role in the inservice growth of teachers.

Observers strongly recommended inservice work and supervisory help for teachers to make more effective their teaching in all curriculum areas and for improvement in classroom management practices. Suggested means of implementation were workshops, having teachers assume a more active role in both long-and short-term cooperative planning with supervision, and various organizational schemes which give each teacher a specific responsible position for planning and teaching and, thus, foster individual teacher growth through active team participation.

There were also recommendations for faster delivery of materials to schools, and the establishment of a resource or curriculum materials center in each school to facilitate distribution and stimulate among teachers acquaintance with and use of a more varied range of instructional materials.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The SEC program as implemented in first and second grades centered on organizational change created by the reduction of pupil-teacher ratios. This evaluation was focused on resulting organizational patterns for instruction within schools, patterns of groupings within classrooms, and the instructional content of reading programs.

A program that introduces additional teaching personnel without, at the same time, increasing building space requires a different and more complex organizational schema. Prior to the full scale introduction of a radical change in classroom organization, preliminary time should be provided for preparation of physical arrangements as well as for deployment and adequate orientation of staff. Schools attempted to absorb the additional personnel mainly by pairing teachers in one classroom, particularly at first-grade level, and by creating a floater or ratio teacher position. The cluster teacher role for coverage of teacher preparation periods was maintained, although in some schools that role was assumed, in part, by the additional personnel.

In essence, the SEC program introduced many additional factors without basic, overall restructuring of organization to accommodate these additions. The single-class concept continued to serve as the base of operation even when the responsibility for instruction was shared by two or more teachers; floater and cluster teachers worked in someone else's class, and many paired teachers assumed responsibility mainly for their own registers, except when taking turns instructing the whole group in curriculum areas other than reading. The addition of other teaching positions, often contributed to fragmentation of the instructional program within a class by subjecting children to repeated interruptions and the need to adjust to several teachers during the school day.

The recommendations of a majority of school personnel and observers for continuation of the SEC program, with modifications, confirmed the need for additional professional personnel in first and second grades in poverty-area schools. However, the recommendations by some observers for single, reduced-ratio classes and the addition of special teachers for reading and English-language development, and for services for children with learning and behavior problems, would be difficult, if not impossible, to implement in all schools. Clearly, space limitations in many schools will not permit the formation of all reduced ratio, single classes. If additional teaching personnel are to continue to be assigned, more effective ways of deploying staff will need to be devised, and role expectancies of teachers will need to change. Administrative manipulation will not, in and of itself, improve the instructional program without concurrent growth in teaching competency. The organizational schema must take into consideration provision for in-service professional growth.

Recommendations to consider in planning future multiple teacher/class programs include the following:

1. Base the number of teaching personnel allotted to a school for a specific grade level on a designated, overall teacher-pupil ratio, without the requirement of specific individual class ratios. This would provide the principal with greater flexibility in establishing various class sizes and teamed arrangements. Very small classes could be established for children with severe learning and behavior problems, with larger classes and/or teamed arrangements for more mature or more stable children. The question of maintaining the pupil-teacher ratio through requiring separate registers (role books) even for cluster or other teaching personnel, requires some further investigation. In its present state, it merely adds confusion as to teacher responsibility in the Early Childhood Program.

2. Provide time for cooperative planning within each school prior to the implementation of a program that involves substantial organizational change. Working cooperatively, the early childhood staff of a school could more readily realize and cope with problems of limitation of space, the addition of many inexperienced teachers, and the scarcity of experienced specialists, as well as the development of new teaching roles and role expectancies. Cooperative planning affords opportunity for involvement by all concerned and holds promise for professional growth in understanding and coping with problems of organization and instruction.

3. Where multiple teacher/class organizations are in effect, create teams of teachers responsible for instructing a given group of children. Delineate teaching responsibilities among teamed teachers to provide for optimum use of professional services and to avoid confusion. The practice of "taking turns," a waste of professional services, might be eliminated if teaching roles were cooperatively defined in terms of the educational needs of each unique group. Incorporate cooperative team planning involving school administrators, SEC coordinators and teachers, for the development of an integrated curriculum and for evaluating pupil progress.

4. Give intensive attention to the entire problem of "coverage" both for teacher preparation periods and in cases of uncovered classes caused by teacher absence; any organizational plans should include the provision of time for cooperative teacher planning sessions.

The majority of teachers perceived the SEC program as having some degree of positive effect on children's reading ability. Classroom observations revealed that individual instruction seldom took place; total group instruction often took place in reduced-register single classes, as well as in oversized single classes; and subgrouping in paired classes usually took place only in reading. However, many teachers reported they felt they knew children better, gave more individualized attention, and worked with smaller groups in reading instruction. The disparity in this data is interpreted as an indication that teachers value an organizational plan that allows for closer contact between teacher and pupils, but they need help in finding ways to capitalize on the plan to realize the potentials of a reduced pupil-teacher ratio. The number of instructional groups in reading and language arts tended to depend on the number of teachers present, and, in some paired settings, one of two teachers present was often not actively involved in instruction in other curriculum areas. Reduced teacher-pupil ratio undoubtedly reduced the size of instructional groups, but it did not always produce widespread practices of individualizing and subgrouping within classes.

The content of reading instruction consisted mainly of structured text materials with little, if any, opportunity provided for using non-text materials. Although a considerable portion of the school day was spent in reading skills instruction, opportunities to develop language concepts and to apply reading in other curriculum areas were seldom utilized. As long as the reading program is concerned with a decoding process unrelated to any other curriculum areas, it will take children a long time to learn to read and to use reading effectively to gain information and for enjoyment.

There was notable lack of time devoted to teaching of social studies and science in both first- and second-grade curriculums. Virtually no subgrouping or individual work was observed in these areas, nor was unit teaching in evidence.

Paperback books for building children's personal libraries were well received. Many teachers evaluated the selections with some degree of positiveness and recommended procuring more books. The provision of these books was an asset to the program.

The position of coordinator holds promise. The coordinator's role should be redefined with emphasis on: (1) provision of direct help for teachers in organizing for instruction within classrooms, in classroom management practices, and in developing teaching skills; (2) assumption of leadership in organizing and supervising cooperative planning among teachers; (3) exploration of more effective approaches for parent involvement; (4) clear delineation of the roles of coordinator and primary assistant principals, with stress on eliminating routine administrative tasks from the coordinator's role; (5) provide coordinators with helpful supervision from district ECE supervisors, the principal, and the primary assistant to principal of the school.

Based upon the responses of professional participants, there was no evidence to suggest that the organizational patterns implemented noticeably affected parent understanding of involvement in the educational process. The few coordinators who devoted large portions of time to attempts at parent involvement reported only slow progress.

The volume of citations concerning lack of space requires recognition. The most critical citations of curtailment of program due to space limitations came from personnel in schools on split sessions. Also cited was the lack of space for small-group instruction and the crowded conditions in multiple teacher classrooms. This suggests there is a limit to the number of professional personnel that can be absorbed and utilized effectively in crowded schools; future investigations need to deal with this question. It also suggests there is need to provide more building space, with space designated for laboratory centers for subgroup work, for resource materials centers, and for parent rooms.

The provision and utilization of varied instructional materials is another area which demands recognition. Well-stocked curriculum resource centers within schools should be provided. Ideally, large curriculum resource centers would be incorporated into library services, where materials can be perused and drawn upon at the time they are needed. In addition, each district should have a large, staffed curriculum resource center where school personnel responsible for ordering materials and teachers can see, select, and learn how to use materials. While it is known that such centers exist, not one of the participating personnel in the sample schools indicated awareness of the existence of such facilities.

In summary, there was evidence of potential strength in restructuring organization for instruction with the provision of additional professional personnel. Subsequent years will require refinements of organization so strengths can be more fully realized. Organizational structure as a vehicle for providing positive working and learning settings for teachers and children, also has potential for fostering professional growth and curriculum modification if cooperative planning and decision making at various levels and supervision are incorporated in the overall framework of organization.

SECTION II

PROJECT GOALS

The major goal of the program was to improve the reading level of children by reducing class size and using additional materials. Funds were provided to reduce the Grade 1 teacher-pupil ratio to 1:15, and to add program coordinators to facilitate implementation of the program. In addition, funds amounting to eight dollars per child were provided for purchase of additional materials. One-eighth of the these funds was designated for the purchase of paperback books intended to build children's personal libraries. A detailed description of the project and its implementation is contained in Section I of this report, A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools in New York City, Parts 5B, C and D: Dr. Mary Wilsberg, Evaluation Director.

This section of the report is intended to assess the influence of the program upon reading levels of children in the first grade.

SECTION II

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		
1	Numbers and Percentages of Project and Sample Schools in Each of the Four Boroughs	89
2	Ethnic Distribution in Project Sample and Comparison Schools	90
3	New York State Readiness and Gates-MacGinitie Reading Achievement Raw Scores for the Project Sample and Comparison Group	96
4	New York State Readiness and Gates-MacGinitie Reading Achievement Transformed Scores and True Score Differences for the Project Sample and Comparison Group	97
5	Median Scores of the Project Sample and the Comparison Group on the New York State Readiness Test and the Gates-MacGinitie Test Compared to the Norms for Each Test	98
6	Mean Independent Change in Vocabulary Test Scores for the Project Sample and the Comparison Group	99
7	Mean Independent Change in Comprehension Test Scores for the Project Sample and the Comparison Group	101

SECTION II

CHAPTER I

EVALUATION DESIGN

This part of the evaluation was designed to assess the extent to which the Strengthened Early Childhood Program (SEC) succeeded in improving the reading level of grade-one children. A sample of program schools and a sample of comparison schools were selected to provide a population of first-grade classes to be tested. The data gathered were used to estimate the influence of the program upon the children's reading vocabulary and comprehension.

Early in the evaluation planning it became clear that the two groups were not equal in school readiness. The analysis of covariance, the conventional means of statistically equating the two groups, could not be applied in this case. Instead, a recently developed technique was used that permits an investigator to calculate the degree of change in each of the groups that cannot be predicted from the readiness test scores.[1] With this technique, the degree of such change in each of the two groups may be compared in order to determine whether there was greater positive change for those participating in the project than for those who did not participate.

The project was not undertaken as a formal experiment and therefore it cannot be known if factors other than those associated with changes in the teacher-pupil ratios and the addition of materials were responsible for differences obtained. For example, in class settings in which there were two teachers and 30 children, a teacher's instructional behavior might have been influenced, favorably or unfavorably, by the presence of another professional. Such an effect could not occur in classes having only one teacher. In this example the difference may be associated with the presence of a second teacher rather than with the reduced teacher-pupil ratio *per se*. A controlled experiment would require that various teacher-pupil ratios be randomly assigned within each school rather than being assigned according to conditions such as available space.

---

[1] Tucker, Ledyard R., Damarin, Fred, and Messick, Samuel. "A Basefree Measure of Change," *Psychometrika*, 31 (4), (December 1966), pp. 457-73.

CHAPTER II

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

A proportional random sample of 16 schools was drawn by the investigator from the 266 schools listed as participating in the program (Table 1), excluding two schools in Richmond for geographical reasons. A comparison group of eight schools was selected, with an ethnic composition similar to that of the SEC program schools.

Three project and two comparison schools did not return the completed test booklets. However, a substitute for one of the "missing" comparison schools was found. The final sample upon which the data of this investigation are based consists of 13 project and seven comparison schools.

TABLE 1

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF PROGRAM AND SAMPLE SCHOOLS IN EACH OF THE FOUR BOROUGHS[a]

Borough	SEC Program[b]		Sample	
	No. of Schools	Per cent	No. of Schools	Per cent
Manhattan	(80)	30	(4)	31
Bronx	(56)	21	(3)	23
Brooklyn	(112)	42	(5)	38
Queens	(18)	6	(1)	8
Total N	266		13	

[a] Two schools in Richmond were excluded from the sampling pool for geographical reasons.

[b] Percentages do not total to 100 per cent due to rounding error.

Data were collected on all first-grade children in the sample schools, excepting CRMD classes and classes that had received ita instruction during the 1967-68 school year. Classes in the SEC program schools included both organizational plans, that is, a teacher-pupil ratio of 1 to 15 and of 2 to 30. The comparison school classes maintained the standard New York City Board of Education teacher-pupil ratio of 1 to 25 or more.

TABLE 2

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION IN PROJECT SAMPLE
AND COMPARISON SCHOOLS[a]

	Negro	Puerto Rican	Other	Total
13 Project Schools	(1041) 43%	(910) 38%	(444) 19%	(2395) 100%
7 Comparison Schools	(731) 71%	(137) 13%	(162) 16%	(1030) 100%

[a] These data are based upon the New York City Board of Education's October 1967 Ethnic Census.

As shown in Table 2, the comparison group was not comparable to the SEC sample with respect to the ethnic distribution of students. As is elaborated upon later in the discussion of the data, the disparity between the two groups in percentage distribution of Puerto Rican and Negro students could well have influenced the results of this investigation.

CHAPTER III

TESTS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATION

Pretest

The New York State Readiness Test, a modification of the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form A, was administered to all first-grade children in New York City Public Schools in October 1967. The six subtests comprising the total score are: Word Meaning, Listening, Matching, Alphabet, Numbers, and Copying. The total scores were used as base-line data of this investigation, in order to ensure maximum reliability.

The test manual reports Spearman-Brown corrected total score reliabilities of .91, N = 167; .91, N = 173; and .94, N = 200, on independent samples. The standard error of measurement did not exceed 4.3 in any of the samples on which the test was normed.[1]

With reference to the nature and purpose of the test, the manual states:

> The progress young children make when they enter school in the primary grades depends to a large extent upon their readiness for learning and upon the provisions the school makes for variations in readiness. Among the chief factors that contribute to readiness for beginning schoolwork are linguistic attainments and aptitudes, visual and auditory perception, muscular coordination and motor skills, number knowledge, and the ability to follow directions and to pay attention in group work. How far advanced the school beginner will be in these skills depends upon many factors, such as his intelligence, his home background, his health and physical condition, his degree of emotional maturity, his social adjustment, and his general background of experience.

---

[1] New York State Readiness Tests, Manual of Directions, p. 14.

> Metropolitan Readiness Tests were devised to measure the extent to which school beginners have developed in the several skills and abilities that contribute to readiness for first-grade instruction.[2]

Posttest

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Achievement Test, Primary A, which was administered in June 1968, yields two scores, one for vocabulary and the other for comprehension. The split-half reliability coefficients corrected for test length are .91 for vocabulary and .94 for comprehension. The size of the sample upon which these data are based is not reported in the manual, but was estimated to be about 480.[3]

Tests were administered by classroom teachers at the direction of the Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education. They were scored and the data processed by the Educational Records Bureau in Manhattan.

Limitations

1. The project sample was originally intended to be partitioned into two groups, the first group consisting of pupils who had been taught in an educational setting of one teacher to 15 pupils, and the second group consisting of pupils in a setting of 30 children with two teachers. Both groups were to have been compared to each other as well as to the comparison group that had a teacher-pupil ratio of 1:25 or more. However, this data on teacher-pupil ratio, which was requested in the test instructions, was not provided sufficiently for the proposed data analysis.

2. The sample of project schools was not completely random since three of the original sample of 16 schools did not participate in the study. Therefore, readers should be cautious in generalizing the results of this investigation to the population from which its sample was drawn.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

[3] Gates, Arthur I., and MacGinitie, Walter H., Technical Manual for the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, (New York: Columbia Teachers College Press, 1965).

3. The comparison schools were to be selected so that the overall ethnic distributions would be comparable. As was shown in Table 2, this was not the end result. The differences between the two groups in mean readiness test scores, as well as the ethnic data, demonstrate that the two groups are drawn from different populations.

4. Students who had missed one or more of the tests were excluded from the analysis. There was a reduction of 53 per cent in the project sample, from 2,395 to 1,127 students, and of 50 per cent in the comparison group, from 1,030 to 516 pupils.

For these reasons, the reader is cautioned not to generalize the results of this investigation beyond the sample of children whose data were analyzed.

CHAPTER IV

TREATMENT OF DATA

As was mentioned in Chapter I, Evaluation Design, the technique used in this study permits an investigator to analyze two distinct components of change: (a) change in reading performance that is entirely predictable from school readiness test scores, i.e., dependent change, and (b) change in reading performance that cannot be predicted from readiness test scores, i.e., independent change.

Independent and dependent change are the two components of true difference scores, "...the best possible estimate of the gain or loss experienced by specific individuals or groups."[1] In this report, only independent change is evaluated because of the difficulties that occur when the same measure is used both as a base line from which to measure change and as the predictor of change. One cannot, for example, discriminate between negative change that stems from imperfect prediction and negative change that results from some loss in ability.

Independent change, in contrast to dependent change, may be thought of as resulting from factors relevant to reading achievement but not measured by, or predictable from, the readiness test. In the present investigation the amount of positive independent change is used as an indicant of the extent to which the changes in teacher-pupil ratio and the addition of materials have resulted in successful intervention into the educational life of the children.

The analysis of covariance could not be used to measure change because the regressions were not homogeneous; the treatment effects and regression effects were not additive. This was true for the regression of each of the two sections of the Gates-MacGinitie upon the total New York State Readiness Test scores. The method used for data analysis in this report is more reliable than a similar method that uses residual gain scores.[2] However, the difference between residual gain scores and independent true score change would be small in the present case because of the high reliability of the first test. Nevertheless, the well known unreliability of change scores dictates that every effort be made to increase reliability.

---

[1] Tucker, Ledyard R., Damarin, Fred, and Messick, Samuel. "A Basefree Measure of Change," Psychometrika, 31 (4), (December 1966), p. 165.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test the significance of the differences between the raw score means of the project and comparison groups for all variables. Since the tests used do not have a common metric, the raw scores of the New York State Readiness Test and of the two tests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Achievement Test were converted to standard scores having a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 15. These values were chosen because a range of scores from 5 to 95 (minus three to plus three standard deviations) approximates a common scale of 0 to 100 for all three variables when the mean is set at 50 and the standard deviation is set at 15. This conversion procedure standardized the metric without changing the shape of the groups' distributions of scores. Both the project sample and the comparison group were combined for the purpose of raw score conversion.[3]

Independent change scores were calculated separately for each of the two groups and each of the two Gates-MacGinitie subtests. These calculations were based on the standard scores. The analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences between the project and comparison groups' mean independent change for each Gates-MacGinitie subtest.

---

[2] Traub, Ross E., "A Note on the Reliability of Residual Change Scores," Journal of Educational Measurement, (4) (Winter 1965), pp. 253-56.

[3] Manual of Directions, New York State Readiness Tests, p. 8.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The data of Table 3 show that the two groups differed significantly in school readiness, the difference favoring the comparison group.

TABLE 3

NEW YORK STATE READINESS AND GATES-MACGINITIE READING ACHIEVEMENT RAW SCORES FOR THE PROJECT SAMPLE AND COMPARISON GROUP

		Project Sample N = 1127	Comparison Group N = 516	t
October 1967 New York State Readiness Total Score	Mean	42.5	47.7	5.91^a
	SD	15.8	17.7	
June 1968 Gates-MacGinitie				
Vocabulary Subtest	Mean	27.0	27.0	
	SD	11.2	12.2	
Comprehension Subtest	Mean	15.5	16.3	1.97^b
	SD	7.2	8.2	

$^a p < .01$
$^b p < .05$
See Appendix E for tabled source of variance.

In groups as large as these, a mean raw score difference of five points on the readiness test only rarely occurs by chance. On the basis of the observed means we can categorize the comparison group as average in readiness, "...and likely to succeed in first grade work," and the project sample as low normal, and "...likely to have difficulty in first grade work," according to the manual for the New York State Readiness Test. It should be noted, however, that the comparison group mean falls at the lower end of the "average" category and the project sample mean falls at the upper end of the "low normal" category.

The Gates-MacGinitie scores, obtained at the end of the 1967-68 school year, show that at that time there were no statistical or substantive differences between the two groups with respect to vocabulary. The two groups' means were similar on this variable. On measured reading comprehension the comparison group was significantly better than the project group, although the difference is not large -- less than one point.

Table 4 shows the relationships between October and June mean scores in each group. All scores have been transformed to standard scores so that they appear as they would if all three tests had the same metric.

TABLE 4

NEW YORK STATE READINESS AND
GATES-MACGINITIE READING ACHIEVEMENT
TRANSFORMED SCORES AND TRUE SCORE DIFFERENCES
FOR THE PROJECT SAMPLE AND COMPARISON GROUP

		N.Y. State Readiness Transformed Scores (A)	Gates Vocabulary (B)	True Score Difference (B)-(A)	Gates Comprehension (C)	True Score Difference (C)-(A)
Project Sample N=1127	Mean	48.54	49.93	+1.39	49.49	+.95
	SD	14.63	14.56		14.33	
Comparison Group N=516	Mean	53.17	49.96	-3.21	51.19	-1.98
	SD	15.27	15.87		16.36	

True score differences in Table 4 show that the project sample exhibited slight positive change in its status over the time period from October 1967 to June 1968 on both Gates-MacGinitie subtests. It is more accurate to think of this positive difference as improvement rather than gain. Gain implies that exactly the same thing was measured in October as in June. However, the readiness test measures several variables in addition to Word Meaning, a subtest that may seem to be measuring the same variable as the Vocabulary section of the reading achievement test.

All four October to June mean true score differences exceed the .05 level of significance. These true score differences reflect some improvement in relative status for the project sample. In contrast, the comparison group exhibited negative change, a loss in relative status over the same time period. The net result is that the project sample shows clear evidence of some improvement and the comparison group shows a loss of relative status. Table 5 shows why neither group can afford an additional handicap.

TABLE 5

MEDIAN SCORES OF THE PROJECT SAMPLE
AND THE COMPARISON GROUP ON THE
NEW YORK STATE READINESS TEST AND THE
GATES-MACGINITIE TEST COMPARED TO
THE TEST NORMS

	New York State Readiness Total Raw Score	Gates-MacGintie Vocabulary	Comprehension
		Grade Equivalents	
Project Sample Median	42.02	1.58	1.54
Comparison Group Median	48.78	1.56	1.58
Norms reported For Each Test Median	54-55.00	2.09	1.89

When the median scores and grade equivalents of both groups are compared with those reported in the test manuals it is clear that both groups fall below the normative medians on all three test variables. Both groups are at a disadvantage when compared with the children whose scores make up the test norms. It is for this reason that the relative loss of status shown by the comparison group is considered an increase in already evident retardation.

Evidence of impairment, in contrast to evidence of improvement is in this case less influenced by considerations of degree than direction. Because reading retardation is commonly observed to increase over time, any evidence of improvement is considered an indicant of change in this pattern of progressive retardation.

In order to determine the significance of the difference in change between the two groups, independent of differences in school readiness, the independent change score was calculated. Tables 6 and 7 show the results of having removed from the Gates-MacGinitie true score that portion that is entirely predictable from the readiness test score.

TABLE 6

MEAN INDEPENDENT CHANGE IN
VOCABULARY TEST SCORES
FOR THE PROJECT SAMPLE AND THE COMPARISON
GROUP

	Project Sample			Comparison Group
Mean	21.15			12.00
SD	12.21			12.02
	SS	df	MS	F
Between	29,615.50	1	29,615.50	200.41[a]
Within	242,495.65	1641	147.77	

[a] $p < .01$

There is a highly significant difference between the two groups' mean independent change scores in vocabulary, favoring the project sample. (Table 6.) In this investigation, this difference is interpreted as an indication of successful program intervention.

The argument for this interpretation is not as strong as it might be, since the evidence that suggests that the groups may differ in more than their teacher-pupil ratio and the amounts of materials each used. They may differ in the relative proportions of Puerto Rican and Negro children represented in each of the groups, assuming that the estimates based on the 1967 Ethnic Census still hold after the 50 per cent sample shrinkage. There is a possibility that the independent change difference might have resulted from a rapid increase in English vocabulary skill during the first year of school by Spanish-speaking children, more numerous in the project sample. Such an increase might of course be quite independent of teacher-pupil ratio or additional materials.

Direct evidence on the ethnic distribution of both the groups would have required that this information be included on the children's test booklets. Requesting such information would probably have resulted in an even greater sample shrinkage than did occur, if only because booklets without that datum would have had to be excluded from the analysis.

It is important to remember that if there were differences in ethnic distribution, such differences make it only possible, not likely, that rapid increases in English language development would appear. For this reason the data of Table 6 may be interpreted to be the consequence of differences associated with increases in teacher-pupil ratio and the use of additional materials.

Table 7 shows a highly significant difference between the two groups' mean independent change scores in comprehension, again favoring the project sample. Although the comparison group was superior to the project sample, in comprehension, (see Table 3), the project sample made significantly greater improvement, as evidenced by the data of Table 7.

TABLE 7

MEAN INDEPENDENT CHANGE
IN COMPREHENSION TEST SCORES FOR
THE PROJECT SAMPLE AND THE COMPARISON GROUP

		Project Sample		Comparison Group
Mean		20.17		14.40
SD		11.94		12.60
	SS	df	MS	F
Between	11,795.64	1	11,795.64	79.78[a]
Within	242,620.34	1641	147.84	

[a] $p < .01$

Based on the evidence of this study, one can say that the stated goal of the program, to improve reading and to prevent progressive retardation in reading, has been achieved with the children of the project sample.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One may conclude from the evidence of this investigation that the major difference between the project sample and the comparison group is that children in the project sample showed some improvement and children in the comparison group showed evidence of progressive retardation. This difference is both statistically and educationally significant.

The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools has achieved its major purpose with respect to the sample tested. The evidence that there was improvement is compelling. The attribution of this improvement to the reduced teacher-pupil ratios and additional materials is possible though not as clear cut.

Two recommendations follow from these conclusions:

1. Because this improvement is related to reading achievement, which is a fundamental skill in almost all school learning, and because it has occurred among those children who need this skill most and achieve it least frequently, the evidence of improvement is sufficient to warrant continuation of the program.

2. The correlates of the components of change should be investigated so that the variables associated with improvement may be specified and action taken to maximize their effects.

SECTION I

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
A1	Ethnic Population of First Grades in Twenty-Five Sample Schools	3
A2	Teacher Responsibility Chart for a Paired First Grade	4
A3	Program for a First Grade Cluster Teacher	5
A4	Program for a Second Grade Ratio Teacher	6
A5	Early Childhood Program	7
A6	Program for a Paired First Grade	8
A7	Summary of Language Arts Instruction for Half Days in Single Grade 1 Classes for Winter and Spring	9
A8	Summary of Reading and Language Arts Instruction for Whole Days in Paired Grade 1 Classes for Winter and Spring	10
A9	Summary of Reading and Language Arts Instruction for Half Days in Paired Grade 1 Classes for Winter and Spring	11
A10	Summary of Language Arts Instruction for Half Days in Single Grade 2 Classes for Winter and Spring	12
A11	Summary of Language Arts Instruction for Half Days in Single Grade 2 Classes for Winter and Spring	13
A12	Summary of Language Arts Instruction for Whole Days in Paired Grade 2 Classes for Winter and Spring	14
A13	Summary of Language Arts Instruction for Half Days in Paired Grade 2 Classes for Winter and Spring	15
A14	First Grade Materials Checklist	16
A15	Second Grade Materials Checklist	20

Table	Title	Page
A16	Major Categories and Subcategories of Problems Resolved and Unresolved	24
A17	Number of Personnel Responses to Problems Resolved and Unresolved	25
A18	Recommendations by School Personnel	28
A19	SEC Program Assets Cited by Single and Paired First Grade Teachers	29
A20	SEC Program Limitations Cited by Single and Paired First Grade Teachers	30
A21	Positive Results of First Grade SEC Program	31
A22	Negative Consequences of First Grade SEC Program	32
	References	33

APPENDIX A1

ETHNIC POPULATION OF FIRST GRADES IN TWENTY FIVE SAMPLE SCHOOLS BY PERCENTAGE[a],[b]

	Schools															
Ethnic Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Negro	35	61	30	99	24	17	41	99	82	39	25	15	18	21	80	66
Spanish Speaking	60	24	50	1	48	50	18	0	17	58	25	78	72	65	20	31
Other (Predominantly White)	5	15	20	0	28	33	41	1	1	3	50[c]	7	10	14	0	3

	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Negro	90	43	3	65	99	63	100	71	90
Spanish Speaking	9	56	60	34	0	37	0	25	9
Other	1	1	37	1	1	0	0	4	1

---

[a] Second Grade ethnic populations were essentially the same as first grade.

[b] As reported by school administrators.

[c] Oriental

APPENDIX A2

TEACHER RESPONSIBILITY CHART FOR A PAIRED FIRST GRADE

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.
8:45	Morning Routines				
9:00	Math Tchr. A	Math Tchr. A	Soc. Stud. Tchr. B	Math Tchr. A	Soc. Stud. Tchr. B
9:50	Reading Skills & Lit. Tchrs. A & B	Reading Skills & Assembly Tchrs. A & B	Science Tchr. B	Handwriting Tchrs. A & B	Reading Skills & Lit. Tchrs. A & B
10:40	Milk and Bathroom				
11:30	Language Arts Reading Groups - Tchrs. A & B and Coordinator				
12:00	Lunch				
12:50	Handwriting	"Pocketful of Fun" TV Reading Skills	Handwriting	"Pocketful of Fun" TV Reading Skills	Handwriting
1:25	Speech (Cluster Tchr.)	Science Tchr. B	Math Tchr. A	Soc. Stud. Tchr. B	Art Tchr. A
2:15	Art Tchr. A	Health Ed.	Health Ed.	Health Ed.	Health Ed.

APPENDIX A3

PROGRAM FOR A FIRST GRADE CLUSTER TEACHER

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
9:00-10:00	ASSIST	TEACHER[b] A	ROOM 1	(Same)	Free Miss X[a]
10:00-10:45	Free Miss X	Free Teacher A	Free Teacher A	Free Teacher A	Free Teacher A
10:45-11:30	ASSIST	TEACHER B	ROOM 2		
11:30-12:20	Free Teacher B	Free Teacher B	Free Teacher B	Free Miss X	Free Teacher B
1:30- 3:00	ASSIST Free Teacher C	TEACHER C Free Teacher C	ROOM 3 Free Miss X 1:30-2:15	Free Teacher C	(Same) Free Teacher C

a) FREE means to take over the entire class, freeing the classroom teacher for her preparation period.

b) ASSIST TEACHER means to provide small group instruction within the classroom.

APPENDIX A4

PROGRAM FOR SECOND GRADE RATIO TEACHER

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
9:00-10:30	With Teacher A---Reading Groups --------------------------				
10:30-11:30	With Teacher B---Reading Groups --------------------------				
11:30-12:00	Free Teacher A---For Preparation Period ------------------ (some Language Arts Instruction)				
12:50-2:10	With Teacher B---Mathematics ----------------------------				
2:10-2:45	Preparation Period for Miss X----------------------------				

There is another ratio teacher who services three second grades, rather than two.

APPENDIX A5

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

Time	GRADE 1 (7 classes - each in a separate room)	GRADE 2 (6 classes - each in a separate room)
8:45- 9:10	Opening Exercise - Providing for individual needs in health, routines, etc.	Opening Exercise - Checking homework - Individual problems - health - attendance, etc.
9:10-10:00	Reading Skills: 2 groups - Stern Phonic approach 2 groups - Formal Reading - Ability Group 3 groups - Formal Reading - Ability and Team Teaching	Reading Skills: 6 groups assisted by 2 student teachers and 2 O.T.P.
10:00-10:15	R E C E S S	R E C E S S
10:15-11:00	Large Group - 1 teacher on "prep" 1 teacher with 30 children	
10:15-10:45		Spelling, Language Arts, etc.
10:45-11:15		Science and/or Social Studies
11:15-12:00	7 classes - Language Arts - Story Telling - Handwriting Lesson	Art - Music - Health Education
1:00 -1:15		
1:00- 1:30	7 classes - Mathematics	Mathematics - Inter-changing of teachers, etc. under consideration
1:15- 2:00		
1:30- 1:50	7 classes - Social Studies	
1:50 -2:10	R E C E S S	
2:05- 2:50		Large Group Teaching - Health Education - Recess - Audio Visual - Some Teachers on preparatory Time
2:15- 3:00	Large groups - 1 teacher with 30 children - Arts and Crafts - Radio - T.V. - Listening music, etc. - 1 Teacher on preparatory	

NOTE: Teachers are relieved by cluster teacher 4 periods a week. Conference periods built into program.

APPENDIX A6

PROGRAM FOR A PAIRED FIRST GRADE

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
9-10 Teacher A, Rm. 1 Teacher B, Rm. 2	* Reading & Language Arts	* Reading & Language Arts	* Reading & Language Arts	* Reading & Language Arts	* Reading & Language Arts
10-11	* 15 in Rm. 1 Math and Recess 15 in Rm. 2	10-10:30 15-Math in Rm. 1 15-Recess 10:30-11:00 15-Recess 15-Math in Rm. 1	10-10:30 15-Math in Rm. 1 15-Recess 10:30-11:00 15-Recess 15-Math in Rm. 1	10-10:30 15-Math in Rm. 1 15-Recess 10:30-11:00 15-Recess 15-Math in Rm. 1	10-10:30 15-Math in Rm. 1 15-Recess 10:30-11:00 15-Recess 15-Math in Rm. 1
11-12 Rm. 1	30 Children Phonics-Teacher A 11-11:30 LUNCH - 11:30-12 Prep. Pd.-Teacher B 11-11:45	30 Children Phonics-Teacher B 11-11:30 LUNCH - 11:30-12	30 Children Phonics-Teacher A 11-11:30 LUNCH - 11:30-12 Prep. Pd.-Teacher B 11-11:45	30 Children Phonics-Teacher B 11-11:30 LUNCH - 11:30-12 Prep. Pd.-Teacher A 11-11:45	30 Children Phonics Teacher A 11-11:30 LUNCH - 11:30-12 Prep. Pd.-Teacher B 11-11:45
TEACHERS	LUNCH	12-12:50	PICK UP EACH	CLASS OUTSIDE	
1-1:45	30 Children Teacher B Science Handwriting Prep. Pd.-Teacher A 1-1:45	30 Children Teacher A Social Studies Handwriting	30 Children Teacher B Science Handwriting Prep. Pd.-Teacher A 1-1:45	30 Children Teacher A Social Studies Handwriting Prep Pd.-Teacher B 1-1:45	30 Children Teacher B Story Handwriting Prep. Pd.-Teacher A 1-1:45
1:45-2	MILK AND COOKIES	-	MILK AND COOKIES		
2-3	30 Children Rm. 1 Work-play or film	Music Assembly in Auditorium Prep. Pd.-Teachers A & B	*15 Children-Rm. 2 Work-play 15 Children in Rm. 1	Film Assembly in Auditorium 30 Children	30 Children-Rm. 1 Work-play or film Teachers A & B

*Use of extra classroom.

APPENDIX A7

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR HALF DAYS IN SINGLE GRADE 1 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING

(OBSERVATIONS: N=30)

	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in All L.A. Instr.			
Observation	No. Total Group	No. Sub-Group	No. Individual	No. Total Group	No. Sub-Group	No. Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Tchrs.	No.Other Adults	Total Adults
Registers of 23-31										
Winter	0,2,1[a]	3,4,0	0,0,0	1,2,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,1	1,1,2
	0,1,2	0,0,2	1,1,1	1,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,1,0	1,2,1
Spring	2,0,1	0,4,0	0,0,0	1,0,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	1,0,0	0,0,1	2,1,2
	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,17	1,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
Registers of 13-18										
Winter	3,1,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,1,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
	0,1,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,2
	1,1,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
Spring	0,0,4	0,0,0	11,0,0	3,2,0	0,0,0	11,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
	2,2,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,1,0	0,0,0	1,2,1
	0,0,1	2,1,0	0,1,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1

a) Each table entry for a given class is in the same position under each category thus, by following the first (or third or 6th) entry in each category, winter and spring grouping in a given class may be seen.

APPENDIX A8

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR WHOLE DAYS IN PAIRED GRADE 1 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING (OBSERVATIONS: N=40)

	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in Instruction			
Observations	No. Total Group	No. Sub-Group	No. Individual	No. Total Group	No. Sub-Group	No. Individual	No. Clrm. Tchrs.	No. Other Licensed Tchrs.	Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter	2,4,1[a]	1,3,6	0,0,0	3,2,4	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,1	2,2,3
	0,4,0	5,1,6	0,0,0	3,2,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,1	0,0,1	2,2,4
	1,0,0	2,6,2	0,0,0	2,3,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,1,0	2,3,2
	1,0,2	4,5,2	0,0,0	3,2,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	1,0,0	0,0,0	3,2,2
	0,1,0	3,4,2	0,3,0	2,4,2	1,0,3	0,0,4	2,2,2	1,1,0	0,1,0	3,4,2
	0,7,4	4,5,0	0,2,0	4,0,0	2,0,0	2,0,0	2,2,2	1,1,0	0,0,0	3,2,3
	0,0,	8,3,	0,0,	0,1,	2,0,	0,0,	2,2,	1,0,	0,0,	3,2,
Spring	3,2,0	0,6,4	0,0,0	3,0,4	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,2,2
	1,0,0	2,2,3	0,0,3	1,3,2	0,2,1	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	1,0,0	3,2,2
	0,0,2	4,4,2	0,0,0	2,2,6	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,2,0	0,0,0	2,4,2
	0,1,1	4,6,2	0,0,0	2,3,3	0,0,2	0,1,0	2,2,2	1,1,0	0,0,1	3,3,3
	0,0,0	2,4,3	0,2,0	4,3,8	3,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	2,1,0	0,0,0	4,3,2
	0,0,0	4,4,7	0,0,7	1,5,0	0,3,4	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	5,2,	0,18,	0,1,	3,1,	0,0,	0,0,	2,2,	0,1,	0,0,	2,3,

---

a) See footnote for A7.

APPENDIX A9

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR HALF DAYS IN PAIRED GRADE 1 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING (OBSERVATIONS: N=39)

Observation	READING LESSONS No.Total Group	 No.Sub-Group	 No.Individual	OTHER LANG. ARTS LESSONS No.Total Group	 No.Sub-Group	 No.Individual	ADULTS INVOLVED IN INSTRUCTION No.Clrm. Tchrs.	 No.Other Licensed Tchrs.	 Other Adults	 Total Adults
Winter	1,1,0[a]	2,3,2	0,0,0	1,0,2	0,3,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0,1,2	0,0,2	0,0,0	1,2,0	2,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0,0,1	2,3,2	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,2,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0,3,2	2,3,0	0,0,0	1,0,0	3,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0,0,4	4,0,0	0,0,0	0,2,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	1,0,0	0,0,0	3,2,2
	0,0,1	0,2,1	0,0,0	2,2,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Spring	3,0,0	0,5,3	0,0,0	0,0,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	1,0,1	0,2,0	0,12,0	3,0,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0,0,1	2,4,2	0,0,0	1,2,0	0,1,2	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0,2,0	0,0,3	1,0,0	4,1,0	0,0,2	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,1	0,0,0	2,2,3
	0,1,0	0,2,0	0,0,0	3,0,2	0,0,2	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,3	0,0,0	2,2,5
	0,2,3	2,5,3	0,0,0	1,1,0	0,1,0	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,2,2
	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3

a) See footnote for A7.

APPENDIX A10

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR HALF DAYS IN SINGLE GRADE 2 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING

(Registers Under 25, Observations: N=36)

Observation	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in All L.A. Instr.			
	No. Total Group	No. Sub-Group	No. Individual	No. Total Group	No. Sub-Group	No. Individual	No. Clrm. Tchrs.	No. Other Tchrs.	No. Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter	[a] 2,1,0	0,0,1	0,0,3	2,1,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
	3,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,1,1	1,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,1	st 1,0,0	2,1,2
	3,0,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	2,0,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
	0,0,4	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,2,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,1,0	1,2,1
	1,2,0	0,2,0	0,0,0	3,0,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	1,0,0	2,1,1
	0,1,0	2,1,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	1,2,0	0,0,0	2,3,1
Spring	2,1,0	0,2,0	0,0,4	1,0,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,1,1	0,0,0	1,2,2
	0,0,1	4,2,0	1,0,0	2,2,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	2,1,1	1,0,0	4,2,2
	3,0,2	0,6,0	0,0,0	2,2,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
	1,0,0	0,3,0	0,0,0	1,1,2	0,4,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,1,0	1,2,1
	0,2,2	0,2,0	10,0,0	2,1,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1
	1,0,0	0,1,0	0,0,0	1,2,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	1,0,0	0,0,0	2,1,1

---

a) See footnote for A7.

APPENDIX A11

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR HALF DAYS IN SINGLE GRADE 2 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING

(Registers 25 and up, Observations: N=40)

	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in All L.A. Instr.			
Observations	No.Total Group	No.Sub-Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Sub-Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Tchrs.	No.Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter	0,0,0[a]	2,2,2	0,0,0	3,1,3	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,1,1	0,0,0	1,2,2
	1,1,2	1,2,4	0,0,0	3,1,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,1,1	1,0,0	2,2,2
	2,0,1	1,2,2	0,0,0	2,0,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,1	0,0,0	1,1,2
	1,0,1	0,4,3	0,0,0	2,0,0	1,0,0	,0,0	1,1,1	2,1,1	10,0,	4,2,2
	1,1,1	3,2,2	0,0,0	0,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	1,0,1	0,0,0	2,1,1
	2,1,1	1,0,2	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,1	0,0,0	1,1,2
	1,0	1,2	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,1	1,0	2,2
Spring	0,0,0	2,2,2	0,0,0	1,1,3	0,2,2	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,1	1,1,2
	0,0,0	11,2,2	11,0,0	6,1,0	0,1,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,1,1	1,0,0	2,2,2
	1,1,0	1,2,2	0,0,1	1,1,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,1	1,1,2
	3,0,1	0,6,2	0,0,0	4,0,2	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	1,2,1	0,1,0	2,4,2
	1,0,1	0,4,1	18,0,0	0,1,1	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	1,0,1	0,0,0	2,1,1
	2,2,1	0,0,2	1,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0	1,0,0	2,1,1
	1,1	2,2	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,1	1,0	2,2

---

a) See footnote for A7.

APPENDIX A 12

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR WHOLE DAYS IN PAIRED GRADE 2 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING

(Observations: N=10)

Observations	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in Instruction			
	No.Total Group	No.Sub-Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Sub-Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Licensed Tchrs.	Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter	0, 1	4, 2	1, 0	1, 1	0, 0	1, 0	2, 2	1, 0	1, 0	4, 2
	0, 1	6, 5	0, 4	2, 2	0, 1	0, 0	3, 2[a]	0, 0	0, 0	3, 2
	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Spring	0, 5	6, 3	3, 0	1, 1	5, 2	1, 0	2, 2	1, 0	1, 0	4, 2
	0, 0	3, 4	0, 3	1, 2	3, 3	0, 1	3, 2[a]	0, 1	0, 0	3, 3
	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2

a) One floater/2 classes

APPENDIX A13

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION FOR HALF DAYS IN PAIRED GRADE 2 CLASSES FOR WINTER AND SPRING

(Observations: N=4)

	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in Instruction			
Observation	No.Total Group	No.Sub-Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Sub-Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Licensed Tchrs.	Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter	0, 0	2, 2	0, 0	0, 0	0, 0	0, 0	2, 2	0, 0	0,0	2, 2
Spring	0, 0	3, 2	0, 0	0, 1	0, 0	0, 0	2, 2	0, 0	0,0	2, 2

APPENDIX A14

FIRST GRADE MATERIALS CHECKLIST
(N=56 Classrooms)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE, BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO[a] RESPONSE
Language Arts	Basal Readers & Other Structured Texts	38	6	36	12	--
	Basal Supplementary Paraphernalia	22	5	4	21	8
	Workbooks	37	3	14	13	--
	Worksheets (commercial)	14	3	6	28	11
	Games	29	16	1	12	--
	Pictures (commercial)	31	11	6	14	--
	Tradebooks	29	24	7	5	--
	Chartpaper	41	6	10	9	--
	Teacher-made materials	36	12	9	6	2
	Tape recorder	3	3	2	49	1
	Record player	34	1	6	24	--
	Flannel board	20	5	10	25	5
	Puppets	19	3	4	35	--
	Dramatics	6	6	4	36	8
	Magazines	1				55
	Other (specify)					56
	Blocks	2	1			53
	Children's drawings	1		1		54
	Projector	11		2		41
	Telephones	10				46
	Television	9		1		46

[a] Represents frequency of no record made on this material. In many instances, this may reflect "not in view" but there is no available check on this.

APPENDIX A14 (cont'd)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO RESPONSE
Mathematics	Counters (specify)	20	6	7	27	3
	Clock	28	5	1	27	--
	Magnetic board and checkers	19	3	2	36	--
	Counting frames	23	2	1	31	--
	Fraction pies or frames	9	2	1	45	--
	Workbooks	20	3	6	29	4
	Kitchen equipment	5			51	--
	Children's mirror	3			53	--
	Class calendar	4			52	--
	Linear units of measure (specify)					56
	Ruler - Yardstick	8	1	1	46	--
	Thermometer model	5	1			50
	Liquid and bulk units of measure (specify)	1			50	5
	Quarts - Pints	2				54
	Measuring cups	2				54
	Scale	1				55
	Games	15	6		29	5
	Other (specify)		1		4	51
	Cut-outs	1				55
	Number charts	6			1	49
	Scale	2				54

APPENDIX A14 (cont'd)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO RESPONSE
Manipulative Materials	Blocks, toys					56
	Peg set, interlocking sets	21	4		30	11
	Puzzles	38	6	3	15	--
	Grocery corner	1				55
	Other (specify)	3			3	49
	Irons	1				55
	Doll house equip.	1				55
Science	Earth Science (rocks, etc.)	7	1	2	42	6
	Fish bowl, plants, living things	16	10	6	27	3
	Physical science magnets, elect. equip., etc.	6	2		43	5
	Texts	7				49
	Other (specify)		1	1	1	53
	Chart thermometer	7				49
Social Science	Economics study	7	3		37	9
	Pictures	18	14	1	24	--
	Textbooks	4			2	50
	Other (specify)					56
	Globe	4				52
	Teacher made charts with products				1	55
	Traffic signs	2				54

APPENDIX A14 (cont'd)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO RESPONSE
Arts	Plastic arts (clay, etc.)	9	2	1	43	2
	Graphic arts (paint, crayons)	43	5	6	33	--
	Crafts materials (scissors, paste)	30	3	6	22	1
	Tools (hammer, saw, etc.)	2		1	49	5
Music	Instruments	14	5	1	33	4
	Piano	8	3	1	42	3
Language Arts	Easel	2	2	1	8	44
	Ginn language kit	1				55
	Pocket charts	5		1		50
	Crayons	1		1		54
	Blackboard	1		1		54

APPENDIX A15

SECOND GRADE MATERIALS CHECKLIST
(N=46 Classrooms)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO[a] RESPONSE
Language Arts	Basal Reader & Other structured texts	34	5	30	7	--
	Basal supplementary paraphernalia	19	3	4	11	13
	Workbooks	25	3	12	10	8
	Worksheets (commercial)	8	3	6	22	13
	Games	13	9	1	17	7
	Pictures (commercial)	23	9	3	7	7
	Tradebooks	25	11	7	5	5
	Chartpaper	33	3	4	3	7
	Teacher-made materials	33	9	3	3	1
	Tape recorder	1	2		39	4
	Record player	13	1	1	30	2
	Flannel board	18	1	2	21	6
	Puppets	13	2		30	1
	Dramatics	7	1		37	1
	Pocket charts	6	2			38
	Other (specify)					46
	Overhead projector	1		1		44
	Filmstrip projector	2	1			43
	Diaramas with stories	1				45
	Television	1				45
	Traffic Signs	1				45

---

[a] Represents frequency of no record made on this material. In many instances, this may reflect "not in view" but there is no available check on this.

APPENDIX A15 (cont'd)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO RESPONSE
	Telephone	2		1		43
Mathematics	Counters (specify)	14	2	2	18	12
	One large abacus	5	2	1		39
	Clock	20	6	3	13	7
	Magneticboard and checkers	21	2		21	2
	Counting frames	20	2	4	16	8
	Fraction pies or frames	9			33	4
	Workbooks	15	2	3	23	6
	Calendar	2		1		43
	Household corner	1		1		44
	Linear units of measure (specify)					46
	Numbered lines	6	1	1	30	9
	Rulers	5		1		40
	Thermometer		1			45
	Qts. Pts.					46
	Liquid and bulk units of measure (specify)	7	1	1	31	7
	Scales	5				41
	Flashcards	1				45
	Hundred board	1				45
	Games	7			31	8
	Other (specify)	4		1	2	4
	Teacher-made games	1				45

APPENDIX A15 (cont'd)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO RESPONSE
	Flannel board	3		1		43
	Number chart	5		1		41
	Plastic figures	1				45
	Hundred board	1				45
Manipulative Materials	Peg set, interlocking sets				1	45
	Potholder loops	1				45
	Puzzles	16	4	1	25	1
	Other (specify)				6	40
	Blocks	2		1	1	43
	Scales	3			3	40
Science	Earth Science (rocks, etc.)	2	3		35	6
	Turtles, plants, living things	13	6	2	25	2
	Magnifying glass	1				45
	Physical Science (magnets, elect. equip., etc.)	6	2		32	6
	Thermometer	6				40
	Other (specify) text	3	1	1		42
	Charts	1	1		2	42
	Weather map	1		1		45
	Triangle tuning fork	1				45
	Economics study	6	3	1	27	10
Social Science	Pictures	16	8	3	17	5
	Globe	7				39

APPENDIX A15 (cont'd)

CURRICULUM AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE BUT LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM	NO RESPONSE
	Other (specify) charts	2				44
	SRA recorded les.	4		1	2	40
	Grocery store	1		1		45
	Flannel fig.	1				45
	Text-basic social studies	3				43
Arts	Plastic arts (clay, etc.)	9	3	1	31	3
	Graphic arts (paint, crayons)	22	8	1	15	1
	Easel	3				43
	Crafts materials (scissors, paste)	22	1	3	22	1
	Tools (hammer, saw, etc.)	2	2	1	38	4
Music	Records, instruments	7	5		31	3
	Piano				43	3

APPENDIX A16

MAJOR CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES OF PROBLEMS RESOLVED AND UNRESOLVED

Aspects of Individualizing Instruction: meeting special needs (slow, fast, emotional) learner; generally, more individual attention given.

Instructional Groupings: class size; homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings; flexibility; small group instruction; and movement of children among groups.

Pupil Progress: reading achievement; interest in learning; evaluation of progress; self concept, and transiency and attendance as related to progress.

Teacher-Pupil Relations: Better teacher-pupil relations--more teacher understanding of children.

Parent-Community Relations: frequency of encounters; and, effectiveness of encounters.

Materials, Equipment and Services: quantity and variety available; use of materials; availability of services (library and buses); and

Professional Growth: more cooperation and sharing among teachers; paired classrooms as training settings; adjustment to new organization; teaching skills; classroom management skills; and absenteeism.

Overall Program Organization: pairing; provision of time for cooperative planning; definition of role of coordinator and of paired teachers; coverage for prep periods; scheduling and use of space available; provisions for discipline, CRMD classes, and Bureau of Educational Guidance services; flexible programming; and classroom internal organization.

Instructional Program: classes for non-English speaking children; reading program; curriculum areas other than reading; open vs. rigid program; staffing; and split sessions.

Space: insufficient space to actually reduce ratios to 1/15 and 1/20; lack of space for small group instruction; and crowded classrooms.

No Problems Resolved

No Problems to be Resolved

APPENDIX A17

NUMBER OF PERSONNEL RESPONSES TO PROBLEMS RESOLVED AND UNRESOLVED

	Grade 1 N=283		Grade 2 N=142	
	Resolved	Unresolved	Resolved	Unresolved
Individualizing Instruction				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	1	2	0	3
Principals (N=25)	10	0	6	0
Coordinators (N=23)	8	0	4	0
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	75	3		
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			44	11
	94	5	54	14
Instructional Groupings: Size, Basis				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	8	0	4	2
Principals (N=25)	6	5	4	3
Coordinators (N=23)	4	4	7	
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	88	34		
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			32	19
	106	43	47	24
Pupil Progress				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	0	4	0	1
Principals (N=25)	0	0	0	4
Coordinators (N=23)	1	0	3	0
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	24	33		
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			6	6
	25	37	9	11
Professional Growth of Teachers				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	12	17	9	4
Principals (N=25)	13	8	6	3
Coordinators (N=23)	8	5	3	2
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	45	21		
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			0	5
	78	51	18	14

APPENDIX A17 (cont'd)

	Grade 1 N=283		Grade 2 N=142	
	Resolved	Unresolved	Resolved	Unresolved
Overall Program Organization				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	15	21	15	14
Principals (N=25)	13	30	17	17
Coordinators (N=23)	11	29	16	6
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	68	122		
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			29	41
	107	202	77	78
No Problems				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	0		0	
Principals (N=25)	2		2	
Coordinators (N=23)	3		1	
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	18			
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			14	
	23		17	
No Problems to be Resolved				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)		2		1
Principals (N=25)	0		2	
Coordinators (N=23)	0		1	
	0	2	3	1
Teacher-Pupil Relations				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	0	0	0	0
Principals (N=25)	0	0	1	0
Coordinators (N=23)	2	0	1	0
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	22			
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			10	
	24	0	12	0
Parent-Community Relations				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	2	1	1	0
Principals (N=25)	1	3	1	2
Coordinators (N=23)	2	1	0	0
Grade 1 Teachers (N=220)	3	16		
Grade 2 Teachers (N=79)			2	3
	8	21	4	5

APPENDIX A17 (cont'd)

	Grade 1 N=283		Grade 2 N=142	
	Resolved	Unresolved	Resolved	Unresolved
Materials and Equipment				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	4	4	2	3
Principals (N=25)	0	4	0	2
Coordinators (N=23)	3	4	0	1
Grade 1 Teachers(N=220)	9	29		
Grade 2 Teachers(N=79)			4	12
	16	41	6	18
Instructional Program				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)	3	4	3	3
Principals (N=25)	7	2	4	0
Coordinators (N=23)	7	11	5	4
Grade 1 Teachers(N=220)	34	37		
Grade 2 Teachers(N=79)			30	27
	51	54	42	34
Space				
Insufficient Space				
ECE Supervisors (N=15)		8		0
Principals (N=25)		8		5
Coordinators (N=23)		11		3
Grade 1 Teachers(N=220)		47		
Grade 2 Teachers(N=79)				22
		74		30

APPENDIX A18

RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

	Number of Mentions				
Subject of Recommendations and Grade Level	ECE Supervisor N=15	Principal N=25	Coordinator N=23	Single Teachers N=66 N=59	Paired Teachers N=154 N=20
CLASS SIZE AND ORGANIZATION (184)					
Grade 1	4	11	9	21	87
Grade 2	4	8	7	17	15
SPECIAL SERVICES AND STAFF (152)					
Grade 1	3	8	9	21	51
Grade 2	12	12	11	12	17
TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING AND PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION (122)					
Training					
Grade 1	11	7	9	2	28
Grade 2	10	4	4	1	3
Planning					
Grade 1	3	3	2	2	7
Grade 2	5	3	3	3	12
INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPINGS (66)					
Grade 1	1	5	5	12	18
Grade 2	1	6	3	4	11
MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT (65)					
Grade 1	1	3	4	11	20
Grade 2	3	3	5	1	14
SPACE (64)					
Grade 1	2	4	5	2	27
Grade 2	2	4	4	6	8
PARENT-COMMUNITY RELATIONS (38)					
Grade 1	3	3	1	3	19
Grade 2	2	3	2	0	2
THE COORDINATOR (29)					
Grade 1	7	1	2	6	3
Grade 2	0	0	0	9	1
THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM					
Grade 1	0	1	3	3	2
Grade 2	0	1	2	2	7

APPENDIX A19

SEC PROGRAM ASSETS CITED BY SINGLE AND PAIRED FIRST GRADE TEACHERS[a]

(Single Teachers, N=66; Paired Teachers, N=154)

Exists As An Asset		Three Most Outstanding Assets		
Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Assets
8	94	1	38	a. pairing of teachers to reduce individual teacher load
38	21	46	24	b. a single Grade I class of 15 children
47	114	30	70	c. opportunity to teach small groups in reading
8	52	4	13	d. time available, due to pairing, for preparing lessons
10	29	2	2	e. ample orientation to the new program
13	41	2	3	f. ample help in organizing your classroom for teaching
24	109	7	62	g. flexible groupings within your classroom based on the needs of children and the special abilities of teachers
14	24	6	8	h. flexible groupings with other classes based on the needs of children and the special abilities of teachers
25	54	7	9	i. help in learning about and using new curriculum content and methods
40	110	22	61	j. opportunity for teaching individual children
16	58	5	14	k. planning together by teachers working with the same group of children
31	84	16	25	l. help of coordinator
20	40	6	5	m. interpretation of educational program to parents and parent involvement
38	73	13	25	n. continuous evaluation of children's progress in reading
44	74	21	26	o. freedom to experiment with new ways of teaching and new materials

[a] Four single and eight paired teachers did not respond.

APPENDIX A 20

SEC PROGRAM LIMITATIONS CITED BY SINGLE AND PAIRED FIRST GRADE TEACHERS

(Single Teachers, N=66; Paired Teachers, N=154)[a]

Exists As A Limitation		Three Most Severe Limitations		Limitations
Single	Paired	Single	Paired	
20	68	18	45	a. Pairing of teachers in one classroom
0	8	2	5	b. A single teacher with 15 children
8	23	3	11	c. Little time for planning for teaching
22	61	14	27	d. Little or no time for joint planning with other teachers
8	14	7	3	e. Little or no continuous evaluation of children's progress in reading
13	24	8	3	f. Lack of opportunity for enough small group instruction in reading
6	30	2	3	g. Small group membership tends to remain fixed over time
22	21	14	12	h. Little or no opportunity for teaching individual children
20	38	12	18	i. Little or no help in learning about new curriculum materials and methods
7	30	5	17	j. Little or no freedom to experiment with new materials and ways of teaching
30	78	23	45	k. Not enough parent contact to foster understanding of the educational program
16	111	13	95	l. Not enough space within the classroom for paired groups
23	95	15	69	m. Not enough space for small group instruction outside the classroom
13	53	9	23	n. Children get confused as to who their teacher is
14	31	12	13	o. Inflexibility of schedules due to instruction by other personnel
0	12	0	6	p. General confusion, chaos, and lack of discipline

[a] Ten single and eleven paired teachers did not respond

APPENDIX A21

POSITIVE RESULTS OF FIRST GRADE SEC PROGRAM (Single Teachers, N=66; Paired Teachers, N=154)[a]

Exists As A Positive Result		Three Most Advantageous Results		
Single	Paired	Single	Paired	Postive Results
6	86	3	58	a. teachers' professional growth because of close working relationship with another teacher in the same classroom
20	50	14	23	b. teachers' professional growth because of organizational and instructional planning meetings with the coordinator
47	108	45	86	c. greater teacher knowledge of individual children's needs, problems, and growth
11	29	6	6	d. involvement of parents as active participants in the educational process
42	104	39	94	e. greater achievement of children in learning to read
36	81	20	38	f. greater achievement of children in other fundamental skills
22	99	15	36	g. children have the opportunity to work with more than one teacher

---

[a] Twelve single and eighteen paired teachers did not respond.

APPENDIX A22

NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF FIRST GRADE SEC PROGRAM

(Single Teachers N=66; Paired Teachers, N=154)[a]

Exists As A Shortcoming		Three Most Negative Consequences		Negative Consequences
Single	Paired	Single	Paired	
24	83	19	56	a. rapport problems among paired teachers
12	39	8	22	b. lack of integration among content areas due to the number of different teachers in various subject matter areas
9	24	8	17	c. necessity of some Grade I teachers to assume a floating teacher role rather than classroom teacher
29	83	22	51	d. parents not involved or interested in the educational process
6	23	6	18	e. no greater achievement of children in reading
6	37	4	20	f. no greater achievement of children in other fundamental skills
15	41	12	22	g. children are confused by having to work with several teachers
2	16	3	14	h. other (lack of unity in discipline)

---

[a] Sixteen single and twenty-nine paired teachers did not respond.

REFERENCES

Board of Education, Books and Instructional Materials for Use in the Reading-Improvement Program, Grades 1-2, Circular, June 7, 1962, New York.

Board of Education, Nathan Brown Circular to All District Superintendents, (New York), October 3, 1967.

Board of Education, The Improvement of Reading by Means of Smaller Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Grades 1 and 2, Exhibit I (PATTERNS), (New York: Board of Education, 1967).

Board of Education, Summary of Proposed Programs, 1967-68, Title I -- Elementary and Secondary Act, (New York: Board of Education).

APPENDIX B

List of Instruments

Page

All Participants in the Title I Evaluation of the Grade 1 and 2 Programs in New York City Poverty Area Schools B1

Evaluation of the 1967-68 Grade 1 and 2 Program in Poverty Area Schools B2

Early Childhood Education Supervisor Questionnaire B3

Principal's Interview Guide B7

Coordinator's Interview Guide B12

Background Information B17

Procedures for School Visits B20

Letter to the Principal of P.S.____ B22

Directions for Program Coordinator's Interview B24

Coordinator's Questionnaire B25

Primary Assistant Principal's Interview B38

Directions for Teacher's Interview B45

Teacher's Interview B46

Administered to all Teachers, Coordinators, and Primary Assistant Principals Interviewed B49

School Summary Report -- Observer/Interviewer Reactions B51

School Personnel Record Form B56

cont'd.

List of Instruments

	Page
Diagrams of Deployment of Space, Children, and Teachers at Four Different Intervals	B57
Directions for Classroom Observation -- Selection of Teachers	B58
Classroom Observation Guide - Spring	B61
Classroom Observation Guide - Fall	B67
Overall Summary of Programs Observed	B77
Spring School Summary Report	B85

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
105 Madison Avenue
New York City 10016

June17,1968

Memo to: All participants in the Title I Evaluation of the Grade 1 and 2 programs in New York City poverty area schools

From: The Evaluation Team and its directors,
Dr. Mary Wilsberg and Dr. Sydney Schwartz

Please accept our sincere thanks for your excellent cooperation in helping us gather information on the implementation of the program for the reduced pupil-teacher ratio in Grades 1 and 2.

We are well aware of the hectic schedules of New York City public school personnel. Your gracious acceptance of this additional burden on time that the evaluational procedure required is fully appreciated.

Our best wishes for a most enjoyable summer.

Mary Wilsberg
Sydney Schwartz

B2

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

April 1968

Title I Evaluations
Early Childhood
Project 05

TO: District Early Childhood Education Supervisors

FROM: Dr. Sydney Schwartz, Evaluation Chairman, and
Dr. Mary Wilsberg, Evaluation Director

RE: Evaluation of the 1967-68 Grade 1 and 2 Program in Poverty Area Schools

Under contract with the Board of Education, the Center for Urban Education has undertaken a study of the E.S.E.A. Title I Program to Strengthen Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools in New York City. The program provides for reduction of the teacher-pupil ratio in Grade 1 to 1/15, and in Grade 2 to 1/20. Also, additional funds are provided for materials, including the purchase of paperback books for children to take home. The major goal of the program is the improvement of children's reading achievement by increasing the number of teachers available to work with children.

Early childhood education supervisor perceptions about the 1967-1968 program are deemed important in this evaluation. It was felt that the information needed could be gathered by means of a questionnaire. Effort was made to construct this questionnaire in a way that will not require extensive writing or time on your part. The data collected from any supervisor is confidential. It will be incorporated into the final report, but no specific district or person will be mentioned in the final evaluation.

It is important that we receive information from all early childhood education supervisors in the New York City system. Your cooperation is sincerely requested. Please return your questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by May 6.

B3

Center For Urban Education

District #_____

Number of Schools in District_____

Date______________________________

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Were you involved in the spring of 1967 in planning for the Strengthened Early Childhood Program for grades 1 and 2?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, what responsibilities did you assume? (Check those in which you actively participated)

   ______ Determining the number of additional personnel required for each school in your district
   ______ Participation in an orientation program for project coordinators
   ______ Preparing written guides for organizing and deploying space and personnel for instruction
   ______ Other (specify)____

2. What per cent of your time have have you devoted to the various early childhood education programs in your district this academic year?

Program	Time
Prekindergarten	_____%
Kindergarten	_____%
Grade 1	_____%
Grade 2	_____%

3. How many meetings and observations related to grade 1 and 2 programs have you been able to have this year?

   _______ Number of district meetings with grade 1 and 2 teachers
   _______ Number of meetings with administrative personnel of schools in your district
   _______ Number of meetings with school program coordinators
   _______ Number of schools in your district you were able to visit to observe grade 1 and 2 programs

4. How effective do you think the spring orientation program for coordinators was? (circle one)

a. very effective
b. effective
c. slightly effective
d. slightly ineffective
e. ineffective
f. don't know

5. How effective do you think the fall orientation of teachers to the new program was? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective
   f. don't know

6. How effective has your district been in informing parents of the new grade 1 and 2 program and involving them in the educational process? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective
   f. don't know

7. How do you feel now about the grade 1 program in schools in your district? (circle one)

   a. completely positive
   b. strongly positive, but not completely
   c. slightly positive
   d. slightly negative
   e. strongly negative, but not completely
   f. completely negative

8. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 1 program? (circle one)

   a. continue as now organized
   b. continue, but modify organization
   c. discontinue
   d. undecided

9. How effective do you think the current grade 1 program has been in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective

10. What problems in your district's grade 1 program have been resolved this year?

    a.

    b.

    c.

11. What problems remain unresolved in your district's grade 1 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

12. What recommendations would you suggest for improvement of the grade 1 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

13. How do you feel now about the grade 2 program in schools in your district? (circle one)

    a. completely positive
    b. strongly positive, but not completely
    c. slightly positive
    d. slightly negative
    e. strongly negative, but not completely
    f. completely negative

14. How effective do you think the current grade 2 program has been in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

    a. very effective
    b. effective
    c. slightly effective
    d. slightly ineffective
    e. ineffective

15. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 2 program? (circle one)

    a. continue as now organized
    b. continue, but modify organization
    c. discontinue
    d. undecided

16. What problems have been resolved this year in your district's grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

17. What problems remain unresolved in your district's grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

18. What recommendations would you suggest for improvement of the grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

19. Additional Comments
    (Please use the back of this page.)

Title I Evaluations
Early Childhood - 05

B7

Center for Urban Education

PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW GUIDE

School____________Date__________________Interviewer__________________

1. How has the addition of a coordinator effected the work load of the primary assistant principal this year? (circle one)

   a. much heavier
   b. heavier
   c. the same
   d. a little lighter
   e. much lighter
   f. don't know
   g. no coordinator

2. Have the roles of the primary assistant principal and the coordinator been clearly delineated?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If no, please note where conflicts or overlapping occur.

3. How effective do you think the coordinator has been in implementing the Grade 1 and 2 program in your school? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective
   f. don't know

4. How effective do you think the fall orientation of all grade 1 and 2 teachers was to the new program? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective
   f. don't know
   g. no orientation

5. How effective have those involved in the grade 1 and 2 program been in informing parents of the new program and involving them in the education of their children? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective
   f. don't know

6. How do you feel now about the grade 1 program in your school? (circle one)

   a. completely positive
   b. strongly positive, but not completely
   c. slightly positive
   d. slightly negative
   e. strongly negative, but not completely
   f. completely negative

7. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 1 program? (circle one)

   a. continue as now organized
   b. continue, but modify organization
   c. discontinue
   e. undecided

8. How effective do you think the current grade I program has been in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

   a. very effective
   b. effective
   c. slightly effective
   d. slightly ineffective
   e. ineffective

9. What problems in your grade I program have been resolved this year?

   a.

   b.

   c.

10. What problems remain unresolved in your grade 1 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

11. What recommendations would you suggest for improvement of the grade 1 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

12. How do you feel now about the grade 2 program in your school? (circle one)

    a. completely positive
    b. strongly positive, but not completely
    c. slightly positive
    d. slightly negative
    e. strongly negative, but not completely
    f. completely negative

13. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 2 program? (circle one)

    a. continue as now organized
    b. continue, but modify organization
    c. discontinue
    d. undecided

14. How effective do you think the current grade 2 program has been in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

    a. very effective
    b. effective
    c. slightly effective
    d. slightly ineffective
    e. ineffective

15. What problems have been resolved this year in your grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

16. What problems remain unresolved in your grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

17. What recommendations would you suggest for improvement of the grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

18. What suggestions do you have to help teachers in paired classrooms assume joint responsibility for instruction in all curriculum areas (as opposed to taking turns in total group instruction)?

19. What suggestions do you have for organizing for instruction in a way that will diminish fragmentation of the instructional program and permit relationships to be made among subject areas?

20. What suggestions do you have to increase parent and community understanding of the grade 1 and 2 program and involvement in the education of their children?

21. Additional Comments

B12
Center for Urban Education

Title I Evaluations
Early Childhood-05

COORDINATOR'S INTERVIEW GUIDE

School______________ Date______________ Interviewer________________

1. What aspect of the coordinator's role do you think you have carried out most effectively this year? (Record only the one aspect deemed most effective.)

2. What three aspects of the coordinator's role do you think are the most important for you to concentrate on to effect the best possible grade 1 and 2 program?

   a.

   b.

   c.

3. How many auxiliary rooms do you have available for small group work, excluding the library, lunchroom, and hall? (List rooms named.)

   Number_____

4. What should be the content of an orientation program for new coordinators?
   (List specific items named)

   a.

   b.

   c.

5. What should be the content of an orientation program for grade 1 and 2 teachers?
   (List specific items named)

   a.

   b.

   c.

6. How should grade 1 teachers be paired? (Ask for procedures and basis.)

7. What suggestions do you have to help teachers in paired classrooms assume joint responsibility for instruction in all curriculum areas (rather than taking turns in total group instruction)?

8. What suggestions do you have for organizing for instruction in a way that will diminish fragmentation of the instructional program and permit relationships to be made among subject areas?

9. What suggestions do you have to increase parent and community understanding of the grade 1 and 2 program and involvement in the education of their children?

10. How do you feel now about the grade 1 program in your school? (circle one)

    a. completely positive

    b. strongly positive, but not completely

    c. slightly positive

    d. slightly negative

    e. strongly negative, but not completely

    f. completely negative

11. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 1 program? (circle one)

    a. continue as now organized

    b. continue, but modify organization

    c. discontinue

    d. undecided

12. How effective do you think the current grade 1 program has been in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

    a. very effective

    b. effective

    c. slightly effective

    d. slightly ineffective

    e. ineffective

13. What problems in your grade I program have been resolved this year?

    a.

    b.

    c.

14. What problems remain unresolved in your grade 1 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

15. What recommendations would you suggest for improvement of the grade 1 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

16. How do you feel now about the grade 2 program in your school? (circle one)

    a. completely positive
    b. strongly positive, but not completely
    c. slightly positive
    d. slightly negative
    e. strongly negative, but not completely
    f. completely negative

17. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 2 program? (circle one)

    a. continue as now organized
    b. continue, but modify organization
    c. discontinue
    d. undecided

18. How effective do you think the current grade 2 program has been in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

    a. very effective
    b. effective
    c. slightly effective
    d. slightly ineffective
    e. ineffective

19. What problems have been resolved this year in your grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

20. What problems remain unresolved in your grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

21. What recommendations would you suggest for improvement of the grade 2 program?

    a.

    b.

    c.

22. Additional Comments

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

To:	Observation Team	Early Childhood Project
From:	Mary Wilsberg	Strengthened Programs in Grades 1 and 2
		Project Number 05

Background Information

The Title I grant to the New York City Board of Education is entitled, The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools. This evaluation is concerned with Part B, Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio in Grade 1 to 1/15; Part C, Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio in Grade 2 to 1/20; and Part D, Additional Materials for Grades 1 and 2.

The summary form of project descriptions states, "The major purpose of these programs is to improve the reading level of children by means of smaller pupil-teacher ratio." It goes on to say that a variety of patterns of instruction are to be tried, with the ultimate goal being that children achieve. The proposal lists the following aspects of the program to be stressed: understanding of developmental needs of little children; of special needs of the disadvantaged, curriculum for early childhood, methods of teaching reading, enrichment of materials for building reading program, diagnosis of reading difficulties, evaluation of progress, teacher training, and community and parent involvement, participation, and training.

The responsibility for the program in Grade 1 and/or 2 is given to the coordinator of the program, working under the supervision of the principal. The proposal lists twelve responsibilities to be assigned by the coordinator. The coordinators were selected by principals from among experienced early childhood teachers. Pre-interviews revealed that the assistant principal assigned to primary grades, in most cases, worked closely with the coordinator in setting up the programs and has continued to work with the coordinator. You may find, too, that the coordinator was last year's acting primary assistant principal. Coordinators are not permitted to carry a roll book, but they are expected to work with children in various aspects of the program. They are figured in the pupil-teacher ratio, I think. You may find that children assigned to a teacher for rollbook purposes are spread around "homerooms" conducted by other teachers.

Winter Interviews and Observations

The evaluation design calls for three days to be spent by one observer in each school in the sample. The sample is a selected random sample of one school from each of 25 districts in four boroughs. The sample was selective in that it was deemed important to get large schools with both paired and single first grade classes and small schools that probably will have less complicated organizational patterns.

Pre-interviews revealed that each school sets up its own organizational pattern for instruction. Large schools may have complicated patterns, particularly in their first grades, with some teachers assigned as "classroom" teachers and others as "floaters." In these settings you may even find subdivisions of "families" of classes. For example, if there are nine first grade classrooms, these may be grouped in families of three classrooms with certain personnel (classroom teachers and floaters) assigned to the specific families. It is expected that the regular special service school personnel will continue to service the first and second grades. Thus, you see that the organization for instruction can be most complicated.

In many cases, lack of space means that two classes in the first grade (approximately 30 children) and two teachers are housed in the same room. These are referred to as "paired" classes, as opposed to "single" classes. Some schools even refer to the "single" classes as "self-contained." All this is merely to alert you to the fact that there is not a common set of terms used to refer to specific settings and arrangements. You may also encounter the terms, "cluster" and "teaming." You will have to find out, in your initial interviews with the program coordinators and assistant principals, what the existing organizational pattern is for first grade and for second grade (expect that, in most cases, these will be different) and what the terms they use refer to. With the coordinator, you will have to identify three first-grade teachers to observe for a half day each, and two second-grade teachers for your half-day observations. These teachers you are to follow through the course of a half day. In situations where there are both "classroom" teachers and "floaters," be sure that one of the first grade teachers identified for observation is a floater. If this happens to be the case with second grades, too (I doubt you will find this), then one of the second-grade teachers identified should be a floater.

If the organizational plan includes both single and paired classes, be sure that two of the first-grade teachers identified are assigned to paired classes and one to a single class. It would probably be easier to take two paired teachers housed in the same classroom.

It is essential that we get a good idea of the various organizational patterns for instruction during these winter visits. Time does not permit (1) the development of the kind of classroom observation guide which calls for the computation of observer reliability, or (2) the training of observers to use such instruments. Based on information gained during these winter visits, we will develop new observation guides for the late spring visits. I will set up a meeting for the entire observation team in March, after everyone has completed winter visits, to plan for the spring instruments. We'll have another meeting in May before the second round of visits to examine new instruments and procedures.

Teacher questionnaires will go out in March or April to approximately 500 teachers (there are over 1400 first-grade and over 600 second-grade teachers in the system). You won't be asked to do anything with this part of the data gathering, other than to offer suggestions for questionnaire items, based on insight gained from your winter visits. These suggestions will be gathered at our March meeting.

Our central objective in this evaluation is a thorough examination of the current organizational patterns and the resulting programs of instruction in Grades 1 and 2. It is important that we look objectively (not through either rose or gray tinted glasses) in an effort to present an objective evaluation. No standardized testing has been included in this evaluation for several reasons. First, achievement tests have not been administered at the end of Grade 1 in the recent past (they do give a couple readiness tests); thus, there is not base line data for comparision purposes. Second, since this was conceived as a two-year program, comparison of standardized achievement test results should not be made until children have completed two years in the new strengthened program.

Schedule for Data Gathering

The total evaluation design calls for the following for each program (school) in the sample:

Winter — Duration: three days
- Conference with principal
- Interview with program coordinator
- Interview with primary assistant principal
- Interviews with the three Grade 1 teachers observed
- Interviews with the two Grade 2 teachers observed
- Half day observations of three Grade 1 teachers and two Grade 2 teachers

Early Spring
- Teacher Questionnaires sent to approximately 500 teachers

Late Spring — Duration: 3 or 3½ days
- Interview with principal
- Interview with program coordinator
- Interview with district early childhood education supervisor
- Observation of the same Grade 1 and 2 teachers observed during the winter visits

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

To: Observation Team
From: Mary Wilsberg

Early Childhood, Grades 1 and 2
Project Number 05

Procedures for School Visits

1. Principals will be notified by mail that their Grade 1 and 2 programs are part of the sample (see your copies of communication sent).

2. Contact principals by telephone to arrange for first day of visits. Wait until January 18 to begin calls to principals to allow for them to receive the letter from me. Ask the principal to make arrangements for initial interviews with program coordinators and assistant principals your first morning in the school. You must interview the coordinator before any classroom observations can be made, because it is with her that you will arrange for your classroom observations. Ask that the coordinator call you early in the morning in case of illness on the day scheduled for your initial visit. If the primary assistant principal is ill that day, you can pick up an interview with her later, although it is desirable that you see her that first morning, too.

3. First Day Visit

9:00 a.m. 1. Brief conference with the principal - pay respects, answer questions on procedures and evaluation design. Tell him his interview is scheduled for late spring. If he isn't going to be in that day, catch him another time.

2. Interview with program coordinator
   - Use interview guide
   - Arrange for classroom visits and noon interview with grade 1 teacher
   - Ask her to take you on a tour of school setting for Grade 1 and 2 programs, if this seems necessary for your orientation
   - Get program organization sheets

3. Interview with primary assistant principal
   - Use interview guide

4. Interview with Grade 1 teacher who is to be observed that afternoon (this will probably need to take place at noonhour)

1:00 p.m. 5. Observation of Grade 1 teacher.

4. Second and Third Day Visits

One full day, first grade a.m. and p.m. observations - two teachers
Noon interviews with those two teachers

One full day, second grade a.m. and p.m. observations - two teachers
Noon interviews with those two teachers

5. Your three days of visits don't necessarily have to be on consecutive days. Make arrangements for the second and third days in a school during your initial interview with the coordinator. Notify her if you are ill on the day of a scheduled visit and reschedule the visit. You will have materials in time to begin visits by Thursday, January 25, so you can call ahead and make arrangements beginning with that date.

6. If any principal responds negatively and you sense trouble, call me immediately and describe the situation. I'll contact CUE and they will work with the Board, if necessary, on the matter. Don't press matters yourself. Put to use your best public relations skills!

Procedures for Reporting

1. You should receive a letter of contract from CUE. You must accept, in writing to CUE, before you can be paid. If you haven't heard from CUE by the end of January, let me know.

2. Keep track of time and expenses and record in designated categories on the sheets provided (see directions attached to time sheets). Make one carbon (a second carbon if you want to retain a copy). Mail the original and one carbon to me at the end of each two-week time period. I'll forward the originals to CUE when all have been received. For expenses, take odometer readings. If you want reimbursement of tolls, you must attach receipts. Record the name of the project, Early Childhood, Parts B and C, and Project Number 05 on all time sheets and any other correspondence.

3. After each day of visitation, check your interview and observation guides. I will give you extra copies in case you need to rewrite to make it legible. After finishing three days of visits in a school, complete your summary form and send it, along with all data collected in that school, to me. Don't wait to return data gathered from all schools assigned to you at once.

Mary Wilsberg Asad Telephone: 865-9199
100 La Salle Street, Apt. 2B
New York, N.Y. 10027

4. Complete a School Personnel Record Form for each school visited. Get this information during your first day in a school. Ask either the coordinator or the assistant principal for the information requested on the district ECE supervisor. Make a duplicate of the Form. Send one copy to me and retain one copy for reference for the late spring visits. Please get this to me after your initial visit to a school. CUE has asked for some of this information.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

January 15, 1968

To the Principal of P.S.__________

Dear ________________________:

Under contract with the Board of Education, the CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION is undertaking at this time a study of the E.S.E.A. Title I Program to Strengthen Childhood Education In Poverty Area Schools in New York City.

Dr. Nathan Brown, Executive Deputy Superintendent has given authorization for this evaluation in General Circular No. 8, 1967-1968.

Your school has been selected as one of a sample of schools for this phase of the study. The research design includes classroom observation of Grade 1 and 2 classes in the winter and again in late spring, interviews with the program coordinator, the assistant principal assigned to primary grades, teachers who are observed, and the principal. A teacher questionnaire will be sent to approximately 500 teachers in the system, including those teachers observed. The sample population includes one school, randomly selected, from each of twenty-five districts.

Within a short time, you will be contacted by a member of the research staff who will make arrangements to spend three days in your school sometime the end of January or during February. On the morning of the first day's visit he will describe briefly to you his work in your school. He will then need to interview the Grade 1 and 2 program coordinator and the assistant principal assigned to the primary grades. Also, he will arrange, through your coordinator, to observe one and a half days in first grade classes and one day in second grade classes. During the noon hours he will interview teachers who were observed. In March teacher questionnaires will be mailed to those teachers observed and to many other teachers in the system. In late May or early June the classes observed in January and February will again be observed. At this time an interview with the principal and a second interview with the program coordinator will be arranged.

Your cooperation is sincerely requested in order that this study may be conducted objectively and under the best possible conditions.

Sincerely,

Mary Wilsberg
Evaluation Director

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

1. Who is the Evaluation Director?

   Sydney Schwartz, of Teachers College, is the Director for The Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education In Poverty Area Schools in New York City. Mary Wilsberg, of Queens College, is the sub-director for Parts B and C, the Grade 1 and 2 programs.

2. Who are the persons assigned to observe and interview?

   College instructors in elementary teacher education who have had experience teaching in elementary schools.

3. What will I be asked to do?

   Inform your program coordinator and assistant principal in charge of primary grades of the evaluation.
   Arrange with the researcher, who will contact you, for the first day's visit.
   Be interviewed in late spring.

4. Will I be informed in advance of visits?

   Yes, you will be notified by telephone.

5. Shall I alert my staff to your visits?

   Yes. The researcher must see the program coordinator before observing the program. In late spring the same teachers observed in the winter will be observed. The researcher must be notified in the event of their absence and another observation date set.

6. Will I be permitted to see any of the instruments you plan to use?

   Yes. However, Center policy does not permit us to leave copies of these instruments with anyone.

7. Will the school be mentioned in your report?

   No. The data collected from any school is confidential; it will be part of the report, but no specific school or person will be mentioned in the final evaluation.

8. Will the completed report be available to me?

   Yes. Copies of the report are sent to the Board of Education, Office of Public Information, Mr. Jerome Kavalcik.

Directions for program coordinator's interview.

Please read through the questionnaire and the interview guide carefully before going to the school.

Leave the entire section entitled Questionnaire with her and pick it up the next time you are in the school. She can complete this independently.

Administer section 2 of the Interview, but leave parts blank where she needs to check figures; if incomplete leave section 2 for her to complete and pick up later in the day or on your next visit. This section deals with program organization, so you will need to ask these questions for your own orientation to the program. Skip over those she can't readily answer.

Administer section 3 of the Interview, but DO NOT LEAVE this section with her.

When you have all three sections completed, please staple together. Under the coordinator's name, indicate (when you get home) whether Negro, Puerto Rican, or White.

Center For Urban Education

GRADE 1 and 2 PROGRAM

COORDINATOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1

1. School ____________ Borough ____________ Date ________

Coordinator's Name ____________________

2. M ________ F ________

3. Undergraduate education: a. Where? ____________________

   b. Major ____________ c. Degree ____________

4. Graduate education: a. Where? ____________________

   b. Major ____________ c. Degree ____________

   d. Number of credits? ____________

5. License(s): (please circle) Early Childhood Common Branches

   Other ____________ Regular Substitute

6. Total years of teaching experience ________

7. Years at this school ________

8. Prior experience: please list the school, borough or city (and state if other than New York), the number of years there, and the position you held.

   School ________ Place ________ No. yrs. ____ Position ________

   School ________ Place ________ No. yrs. ____ Position ________

   School ________ Place ________ No. yrs. ____ Position ________

9. Current teaching role within the program ____________________

10. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in the teaching role ____

11. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in planning for instruction with teachers in

    a. group planning ________________
    b. planning with individuals ____________
    c. guiding student and/or apprentice teachers ___________

12. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in parent-related work in

    a. arranging for parent-teacher conferences ___________

    b. other parent contacts (conferences, calls) _____________________

    c. parent-teacher meetings or other community contacts (number so far this year) ____

13. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in previewing and listing visual aids and basic instructional materials _______________

    a. at the beginning of the year ________________________________

14. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent serving as a liaison person with administrative and teaching personnel ___________________

15. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in assessing pupil progress by

    a. evaluating profile records of children ___________________

    b. giving appropriate short-term informal tests ______________

16. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in guiding and assisting in pupil grouping and regrouping _______________

    a. at the beginning of the year __________

17. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in scheduling use of space and equipment __________________

    a. at the beginning of the year ____________

18. Approximate number of demonstration lessons given so far this year ______

19. Approximate number of hours per week currently spent in conferencing with the primary assistant principal ______________

    a. at the beginning of the year __________

20. Did you have training sessions prior to the opening of school in September?

yes __________ no ________

If yes, then how much time was spent with

a. Grade 1 and 2 teachers together ______ hours

b. Grade 1 teachers separately __________ hours

c. Grade 2 teachers separately __________ hours

d. Inexperienced teachers (both Grades 1 and 2) ______________ hours

21. If no, did you have special planning sessions after school started in September? yes ________ no __________

a. Where? __________________________

b. How much time was spent? __________________________

22. Did anyone assist you with the September planning sessions? yes ____ no ____

23. If yes, who? (circle number of those who helped)

1. Assistant principal
2. Principal
3. ECE supervisor
4. Other (specify)

How?

24. What were your major problems in setting up the program in September? (number in order of magnitude of problem, beginning with 1, indicating greatest problem)

______________ assignment of space

______________ assignment of personnel to space and role

______________ acquiring and distributing audiovisual and instrumental materials

______________ setting up pupil grouping

______________ setting up a schedule

______________ other (specify)

25. What are your major problems currently? (again, number in descending order according to magnitude)

______________ utilization of space

______________ feelings of teachers concerning assigned role and space

______________ effective utilization of audiovisual and other instructional materials

______________ grouping and regrouping of pupils

______________ gaining parent and community involvement

______________ rapport with teachers or administrative staff

______________ competency of teachers

______________ other (specify)

Center For Urban Education

PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S INTERVIEW

Section 2: Program Organization

26. What is the total number of pupils?

a. Grade 1 ____________ Grade 2 __________

27. What is the ethnic population?

a. Grade 1	b. Grade 2
Negro _______%	Negro ______%
Spanish Speaking _______%	Spanish Speaking ______%
P. R. ________	P. R. ________
Dom. Rep. ______	Dom. Rep. _____
Cuban _______	Cuban ______
Other _______%	Other _______%
Oriental _______	Oriental ______
White _______	White _______

28. Does this represent the ethnic population of the total school?

Yes ________ No _______

29. If no, how is it different?

30. Appriximate number of Non-English children in categories listed below for

a. Grade 1	b. Grade 2
1 -- 4 ______	1 -- 4 ______
5 -- up _____	5 -- up _____

31. Number of allotted teaching positions for

a. Grade 1 _______ b. Grade 2 ______

32. Number of filled teaching positions for

a. Grade 1 _______ b. Grade 2 _____

33. Number of teaching positions allotted to the Grade 1 and 2 programs, but assigned elsewhere in the school ______________________________

34. Number of teaching positions not filled because the Board has not assigned anyone to the position __________________________________

35. Background of teaching experience of teachers in

a. Grade 1

No. with experience ________

No. without experience _____

I. T. T. _____

b. Grade 2

No. with experience _____

No. without experience _____

I. T. T. _____

36. Number of classrooms in use in

a. Grade 1 _________

b. Grade 2 __________

37. Number of first-grade classrooms with a pupil-teacher ratio of

a. 1/15 ________ (single)

b. 2/30 __________ (paired)

38. Number of second-grade classrooms with a pupil-teacher ratio of

a. 1/20 ______

b. 1/more than 20 _______

(designate no. of pupils) ___

39. Please indicate the kind of teaching positions found in each grade and the number of teachers in those positions currently

a. Grade 1

no. of classroom tchrs. _____

no. of floating tchrs. ______

other (specify) _______

b. Grade 2

no. of classroom tchrs. ____

no. of floating tchrs. _____

other (specify) _____

40. Please indicate the number of preparatory periods per week for each position

a. Grade 1

classroom tchr., no. ____

floater, no. ____

other (specify), no. ____

b. Grade 2

classroom tchr., no. ____

floater, no. ____

other (specify), no. ____

41. Please indicate the approximate number of hours per week other resource personnel ordinarily assigned to the school devote to the Grade 1 and Grade 2 programs. If none, please write none.

		Grade 1	Grade 2
a.	Non-English Speaking Coordinator	______	______
b.	Auxiliary Teachers (specify) ______________	______	______
	______________	______	______
	______________	______	______
	______________	______	______
c.	Guidance Counselor	______	______
d.	School Aide (s)	______	______
	How many?	______	______
e.	Student Teacher/	______	______
	How many?	______	______
f.	Librarian	______	______
g.	Cluster Teacher	______	______

42. Is the time spent by the above personnel more, the same, or less than the time they spent in Grades 1 and 2 last year?

a. Grade 1	b. Grade 2
more ________	more ________
the same _____	the same _____
less ________	less ________

c. If more, specify by whom and in which grade ______________

____

d. If less, specify by whom and in which grade ______________

____

____

43. On what basis were children assigned to classroom settings in September?

a. Grade 1 b. Grade 2

44. Were small groups that meet regularly set up?

a. Grade 1 yes _____ no _____ b. Grade 2 yes _____ no _____

45. If yes for Grade 1, what are the content areas for each small group and the basis for grouping? (Please list name of content area, basis for grouping, and times per week it meets.)

Content area	Basis	No. of meetings/week
____________	______	____________________
____________	______	____________________
____________	______	____________________
____________	______	____________________

46. If yes for Grade 2 what are the content areas and basis for grouping for each small group? (Please list name of content area, basis for grouping and times per week it meets).

Content area	Basis	No. of meetings/week
____________	______	____________________
____________	______	____________________
____________	______	____________________
____________	______	____________________

47. Does membership in the samll, regularly meeting groups change? (Circle one)

a. very frequently

b. frequently

c. seldom

d. almost never

48. Usually, who determines change in small group membership? (circle one)

a. teacher of small group

b. classroom teacher

c. coordinator

d. coordinator with a teacher

e. other (specify) ______________________________

49. What criteria are used to determine need to change a child from one small group to another?

50. Have any special provisions been built into the organizational plan for individual instruction?

yes ________ No ________

If yes, describe:

51. Does the organization provide for the occurrence of spontaneously formed small groups?

yes ________ no ________

If yes, how?

52. How would you rate the competency of your staff?

a. Grade 1		b. Grade 2	
no. competent	_____	no. competent	_____
no. adequate	_____	no. adequate	_____
no. inadequate	_____	no. inadequate	_____

53. Are you able to get substitute teachers when Grade 1 and 2 teachers are absent? (circle one)

a. yes, all the time
b. usually, but not always
c. about half the time
d. slightly under half the time
e. seldom

54. Approximately what per cent of the time would you say you have been able to get substitute teachers for Grades 1 and 2 when needed? ________%

Center for Urban Education

PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S INTERVIEW

Section 3: Perceptions

53. How did you feel about the Program when it began? (circle number)

    1. Enthusiastic
    2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    3. Slightly positive
    4. Slightly negative
    5. Strongly negative

54. How do you feel about the Program now? (circle number)

    1. Enthusiastic
    2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    3. Slightly positive
    4. Slightly negative
    5. Strongly negative

55. What is the general attitude of your staff of teachers to the program? (circle one)

    1. Enthusiastic
    2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    3. Slightly positive
    4. Slightly negative
    5. Strongly negative

    If 4 or 5, why?

56. Can you get all teachers at one grade level together at the same time if you wish to?

    yes ______ no _______

    If no, why?

57. When you have group meetings dealing with instructional approaches and methodology, how effective do you think they are? (circle one)

1. Extremely effective
2. Moderately effective
3. Slightly effective
4. Not effective

58. Has the reduced pupil-teacher ratio resulted in changes in methods of instruction?

1. yes _______ 2. no _______

59. If yes: Have these changes been: (circle number)

1. Substantial 2. Moderate 3. Slight

Specify:

60. How adequate have the provisions been of materials and equipment in your program? (circle number)

1. More than adequate
2. Adequate
3. Less than adequate

61. How effective do you consider these materials and equipment? (Consider availability, frequency of use, quality, appropriateness, etc.) (circle one)

1. Very effective
2. Moderately effective
3. Slightly effective
4. Ineffective

Why?

62. Have there been changes in the teaching of reading? yes _____ no _____

63. If yes, what kinds of changes?

64. Do you think the program has had an effect on the number of children who begin to learn to read?

yes _______ no _______

65. If no, why?

66. How is pupil progress in learning to read being evaluated? (circle all procedures used)

1. by one teacher
2. by a group of teachers
3. by one teacher and the coordinator
4. by a group of teachers and the coordinator
5. other (specify) ________________________________

67. To what degree has the assistant principal been of help to you this year? (circle one)

1. Extremely helpful
2. Slightly helpful
3. Not helpful
4. A hindrance

68. How do you think the 1967-68 Grade 1 and 2 Program has changed the role of the assistant principal? (circle one)

1. made her role heavier
2. made her role lighter
3. no change

69. If 1 or 2, why?

70. To what degree has the Early Childhood supervisor been of help to you? (circle one)

1. Extremely helpful
2. Slightly helpful
3. Of no help

Specify:

71. Has the principal been helpful? (circle one)

    1. Extremely helpful
    2. Slightly helpful
    3. Of no help

    Specify:

72. What problems have been resolved?

73. What problems remain unresolved?

74. What do you consider the most valuable aspect of the program that you have implemented?

75. Additional comments:

Center for Urban Education

Early Childhood: Gr 1 - 2

PRIMARY ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW

School ______ Borough ______ Date ______________ Interviewer ________

Assistant Principal's Name __________________________

1. How long have you been assistant principal at this school? __________

2. What did you do before becoming assistant principal here?

3. How did you feel about the strengthened Grade 1 and 2 Program when it began? (circle number)

    1. Enthusiastic
    2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    3. Slightly positive
    4. Slightly negative
    5. Strongly negative

    Why?

4. How do you feel about the program now? (circle number)

    1. Enthusiastic
    2. Positive, but not enthusiastic
    3. Slightly positive
    4. Slightly negative
    5. Strongly negative

    Why?

5. Were space additions, changes, or adjustments made to accomodate the Program? yes _______ no ________

6. If yes, what? when?

7. Were Grade 1 and 2 staff orientation and/or workshops conducted at your school in September? yes ________ no _______

8. If yes, what? Who conducted them?

9. Who attended the September meetings?
   Only new staff ________
   Grade 1 and 2 together ________
   Old and new staff __________
   Grade 1 and 2 separately __________

10. What guides or other materials designed to help set up organizational patterns, inform staff, and evaluate the program have you, the coordinator, or teachers, received from the Board of Education? (110 Livingston St., District Superintendent ECE Supervisor)

	From Whom?	When Received?	Usefulness?
1. Sample organizational patterns			
2. Guidelines for evaluating			
3. Staff bulletins			
4. Other (specify)			

11. What staff positions do you have in your organizational plan? (Write none if position does not exist.)

	Number Grade 1	Number Grade 2
1. Paired teachers		
2. Single teachers		
3. Floating teachers		
4. Cluster teachers		
(regular auxiliary personnel-list by role)		
5. Non-English coordinator		
6. Other (specify)		

12. On what basis was staff assigned to particular positions in the fall? (More than one factor may be named.)

	Grade 1	Grade 2	Cluster
1. Personalities of teachers			
2. Length of experience of teachers			
3. Requests made by teachers			
4. Other (specify)			

Basis for criteria used for assignment -

13. How were pupils assigned to groups in the fall?

	Grade 1	Grade 2
1. Classroom homogeneous grouping (specify basis - i.e., ethnic, ability, adjustment		
2. Classroom heterogeneous grouping		

3. Regularly scheduled subgroups (specify group and basis)
reading ______________ ______________________
______________ ______________________
______________ ______________________
______________ ______________________

14. How do you feel about the current organizational pattern for Grade 1 in your school? (If a particular category named below does not exist, write none on top line.)

	1. Paired Classes	2. Single Classes	3. Scheduled Small Group Patterns	4. Floater Pattern	5. Cluster Pattern	6. Coordinator
1. Enthusiastic						
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic						
3. Slightly positive						
4. Slightly negative						
5. Strongly negative						

15. Why?

16. How do you feel about the current organizational pattern for Grade 2 in your school? (If a particular category named below does not exist, write none on top line.)

	1. Paired Classes	2. Single Classes	3. Scheduled Small Group Patterns	4. Floater Pattern	5. Cluster Pattern	6. Coordinator
1. Enthusiastic						
2. Positive, but not enthusiastic						
3. Slightly positive						
4. Slightly negative						
5. Strongly negative						

17. Why?

18. Is there any confusion between pupil-teacher ratio with class size? (i.e. rollbooks, perception of procedures for determining class size, actual class size and appearance of class size as it appears statistically.)

19. How is regrouping of children carried on?

By whom?

20. In reference to subgroup structure (other than assigned classroom group) what is the frequency of the formation of new groups and the disbanding of old groups?

	Grade 1	Grade 2
1. Very frequent changes		
2. Frequent changes		
3. Some changes		
4. Infrequent changes		
5. No changes		
6. Don't know		

21. What new subgroups have emerged this year?

22. What is the frequency of pupil change in membership in subgroups?

	Grade 1	Grade 2
1. Very frequent changes		
2. Frequent changes		
3. Some changes		
4. Infrequent changes		
5. No changes		
6. Don't know		

(There may be reasons for very frequent, or no changes, in specific subgroups. Please note specific groups mentioned and reasons.)

26. How has the strengthened Grade 1 and 2 Program changed your role this year?

Much heavier _____ heavier _____ same _____ little lighter _____ much lighter _____

Why?

27. How do you feel about the position of coordinator?

28. What specific strengths does the Strengthened Program have?

29. What specific weaknesses does the Strengthened Program have?

30. What recommendations do you have to improve organizational patterns?

31. What problems have been resolved?

32. What problems have not been resolved?

Directions for teacher's interview.

Please tell teachers that they will receive a teacher's questionnaire by mail in March or April, and that other data pertinent to the total evaluation will be gathered at that time. I think alerting them to the arrival of the questionnaire and the need for the information to be gathered will help obtain a better return. Since we particularly need this data on teachers observed, I will let you know if any of your teachers did not return the questionnaire before your May/June visits and you can follow up with them at that time.

I have deliberately kept this interview short because of the short time you will have to do this. Also, much of the data can be supplied by them independently using the questionnaire form later. The most important aspect of the interview is to give them an opportunity to voice their perceptions about the program. Since the interview guide is relatively short, make additional comments as freely as you wish; however, list separately, by number, each point you make. (This helps tremendously in data analysis.)

When you get home, note whether Negro, P.R., or White on interview guide under teacher's name.

GRADE 1 and 2 PROGRAM

TEACHER'S INTERVIEW

1. School____________________ 2. Borough______________ Date___________

Interviewer__________________________ Teacher's name_______________

3. Grade 1______ 2________

4. Position: classroom teacher____

Floater______________________

5. Classroom settings: Paired________ Single________ Other (specify) _____

6. Number of other classes on grade level: paired________ Single________

7. How do you feel about the Grade 1 (2) program in your school? (circle number)

    1. Completely positive
    2. Strongly positive but not completely
    3. Slightly positive
    4. Slightly negative
    5. Strongly negative but not completely
    6. Completely negative

8. Why?

9. What do you consider the specific strengths of the program at your grade level?

10. What do you consider the specific weaknesses of the program at your grade level?

11. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the organizational framework?

12. What problems, for you, have been resolved?

13. What problems, for you remain unresolved?

14. How effective do you think the position of program coordinator, as carried out in your school, has been? (circle number)

    1. Extremely effective
    2. Very effective but not completely
    3. Slightly effective
    4. Slightly ineffective
    5. Very ineffective but not completely
    6. Completely ineffective

15. Why?

To the interviewer:

If no mention is made of (16) feelings about working with a team, or group, of teachers, (i.e., in planning, in living in the same classroom -- paired -- with another teacher, or any other kind of interpersonal relations), or meeting the daily timetable where a regularly scheduled small group arrangement is in effect, than try asking a couple probing questions re these matters -- if any time remains.

16.

17.

18. Additional comments

QUESTIONNAIRE

Administered to all teachers, coordinators,
and primary assistant principals interviewed.

School____________________

Teacher, Coordinator, Assistant Principal (circle one)
Grade 1 2 (circle one)

(Coordinators and Assistant Principals should respond to Grade 1 and 2 Programs, separately; teachers should respond only for their grade level.)

1. How do you feel now about the continuation of the Strengthened Program? (circle one)

	Grade 1		Grade 2
a.	continue as now organized	a.	...
b.	continue, but modify organization	b.	...
c.	discontinue	c.	...
d.	undecided	d.	...

Grade 1: If (b) continue, but modify organization, please list specific modifications you see as necessary.

If a, c, or d, why?

Grade 2: If (b) continue, but modify organization, please list specific modifications you see as necessary.

If a, c, or d, why?

2. How effective do you think the Program has been to date in terms of meeting the major goal of the program, a more effective instructional program in the teaching of reading? (circle one)

	Grade 1		Grade 2
a.	very effective	a.	...
b.	effective	b.	...
c.	slightly effective	c.	...
d.	ineffective	d.	...
e.	don't know	e.	...

Grade 1: Why?

Grade 2: Why?

(Please staple this to each of the Teacher, Coordinator, and Assistant Principal Interview Guides.)

Early Childhood 05

Grade 1 and 2

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

Observer/Interviewer Reactions

Observer/Interviewer ____

School ______________ Borough ____________________ Dates of Visits ________

Based on your first round of visits to ________, please indicate your reactions to questions listed below:

1. How would you judge the working relationship of the program coordinator and the primary assistant principal? (circle one)

    a. extremely positive, close and mutually supportive
    b. positive, with good working agreements
    c. slightly positive
    d. slightly negative
    e. negative

    Basis for response.

2. How would you judge the competency of the coordinator in perceiving and carrying out her assigned role? (circle one)

    a. highly competent
    b. competent
    c. adequate
    d. barely adequate
    e. incompetent

    Basis for response.

3. What problems did the coordinator cite, related to carrying out her role, over which she has no control?

4. How would you judge the working relationship the coordinator has established with the teachers? (circle one)

Grade 1	Grade 2
a. very positive	a. ...
b. positive	b. ...
c. slightly positive	c. ...
d. slightly negative	d. ...
e. negative	e. ...

Basis for response.

5. What was the approximate per cent of time you saw paired Grade 1 classes in instructional settings with one teacher and more than fifteen children? (refer to observation guide - circle one)

a. 100 per cent of the time
b. 75 per cent of the time
c. 50 per cent of the time
d. 25 per cent of the time
e. less than 25 per cent of the time

Was there usually another, uninvolved teacher present? yes _____ no _____
If yes, how often?

6. What was the frustration level of the primary assistant principal over the Programs? (circle one)

	Grade 1 Program		Grade 2 Program
a.	very extremely high	a.	...
b.	high	b.	...
c.	moderate	c.	...
d.	low	d.	...
e.	very low	e.	...

If a, b, or c, what was causing the frustration? (indicate grade level)

7. What was the frustration level of the coordinator over the Programs?

	Grade 1 Program		Grade 2 Program
a.	very high	a.	...
b.	high	b.	...
c.	moderate	c.	...
d.	low	d.	...
e.	very low	e.	...

If a, b, or c, what was causing the frustration? (Indicate grade level)

8. What was the frustration level of the teachers over the Program?

	Grade 1		Grade 2
a.	very high	a.	...
b.	high	b.	...
c.	moderate	c.	...
d.	low	d.	...
e.	very low	e.	...

If a, b, or c, what was causing the frustration? (Indicate which grade level)

9. In your opinion, what are the most effective aspects of this Program? (Please list a, b, ...)

10. In your opinion, what are the greatest problems of this Program? (Please list a, b, ...)

What is the cause of these problems?

11. In your opinion, is there a possibility for the problems encountered in this Program to be solved (assume the same physical plant)?

If yes, how?
If no, why?

12. In your opinion, does this Program, as now in operation, have greater potential to improve the reading level of children than last year's Grade 1 and 2 programs, where the pupil-teacher ratio was higher?

    If so, why?

13. Additional comments

Early Childhood Project
Number 05

School Personnel Record Form

Observer__________

School______________ Borough_____________

Address

School Telephone________
Date First Visit________
Tentative Dates
for 2nd and 3rd Visits
____

Principal_________________________

Assistant Principal Assigned to Grades 1 and 2_____________________________

Program Coordinator_______________________

First Grade Teachers Observed — Room Number

1. __________________________ __________
2. __________________________ __________
3. __________________________ __________

Second Grade Teachers Observed

1. __________________________ __________
2. __________________________ __________

District Early Childhood Supervisor________________________

Office Address

Telephone

(You may want to note transportation directions to the copy you retain.)
Please return this to me after each initial school visit.

Obs: b.c.-05
AM___PM___

DIAGRAMS OF DEPLOYMENT OF SPACE, CHILDREN, AND TEACHERS AT FOUR DIFFERENT INTERVALS

School______Borough______Grade______Date_______Observer____________________________

x - child; o - teachers

Time
(Check one)

Home Classroom

Other Location (specify)

8:45_____
12:30_____
(starting time)

Teacher A__________Activity___________ Teacher A____________Activity______
(role) B__________ ___________ B____________ ______

9:15____
1:00____

Teacher A__________Activity___________ Teacher A___________Activity_______
B.__________ ___________ B___________ _______

10:30____
2:00____

Teacher A_________Activity___________ Teacher A___________Activity________
B_________ ___________ B___________ ________

11:00____
2:30____

Teacher A_________Activity__________ Teacher A__________Activity________
B_________ __________ B__________ ________

Total number of different personnel_______
List roles____________________No._______
____________________No._______
____________________No._______
____________________No._______
____________________No._______

Total Number of large class groupings_____
Total number of subgroupings _____
Total number of individual settings______

Early Childhood Program

Grades 1 and 2

DIRECTIONS FOR CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Selection of Teachers

Identify three Grade 1 teachers and two Grade 2 teachers with the program coordinator. Arrange for a half day observation of each teacher identified. Ask the coordinator to inform the teachers about the observation and to assure them that neither their name nor the name of the school will appear anywhere in the reporting of the data, and anonymity is guaranteed.

You should reaffirm this at the beginning of the teacher interview.

Grade 1 Teachers:
According to Organization

If there are both paired and single classrooms, take one paired classroom (two teachers) and one single classroom.

If there are only paired classrooms and floating teachers assigned to those classrooms, take one paired classroom (two teachers) and one floater.

If there are paired classrooms, single classrooms, and floaters, take one paired classroom (two teachers) and one single classroom.

If there are only paired classrooms, take the two teachers in one paired classroom and one teacher from another paired classroom.

If there are only single classrooms and floaters, take two single classroom and one floater.

Wherever there are paired classrooms, always take both teachers in the one classroom and stay with that group all day. It is possible that both teachers will do all their teaching in that classroom. It is also possible that one teacher may leave the classroom to teach a group of children elsewhere in the building. If you find the latter situation, you will need to identify one teacher to follow in the morning and the other teacher to follow in the afternoon. Identify one teacher as the A.M. teacher and the other as the P.M. teacher on your Observation Guides and Teacher Interview Guides.

If you are observing a floating teacher, follow her the entire half day. If floaters are assigned different subject matter areas, take a floater assigned to language arts instruction.

According to other factors

Tell the coordinator that we are interested in the reactions of both experienced and new teachers. Be sure you get at least one first year teacher and one experienced teacher. In paired classrooms you may find two inexperienced teachers (then get an experienced teacher for the third observation), two experienced teachers (then get an inexperienced teacher from another classroom, or a floater), or an experienced and an inexperienced teacher teamed. The criterion of experience is better to use than the criterion of competency - incompetency for several reasons, but primarily because assignment of teaching position, in many schools, was based on the experienced-inexperienced criterion.

Selection of Grade 2 Teachers

It is doubtful that you will find paired classes in Grade 2. If you do, take both teachers, regardless of the experience criterion, because this setting will be a novelty.

Where single classrooms only are found, take one experienced and one first year teacher.

Where there is a single classroom and floating teacher pattern, take one classroom teacher and one floating teacher (language arts, if there is one assigned to this); one with experience and one without.

Language Arts Observation

Since the major goal of the strengthened program is gain in reading achievement, record separately, using pages 2, 3, and 4 of the observation guide, all instructional language arts groups in operation in the group you are observing. If you are in a paired classroom, complete the subgroup observation section for each sub-group observed, even though you may have needed to identify separately the A.M. and P.M. teachers because one teaches elsewhere at times. If one classroom teacher goes to another location, try to catch enough of her lesson to complete the subgroup language arts observation guide for that group, as well as the subgroup staying in the classroom (follow the teachers identified, regardless of whom they are teaching). If a floater takes a group elsewhere, follow her and make that observation too, if possible, on the day you are working a paired classroom.

During half-day floater observations, stay with that floater; don't try to make any classroom subgroup observations.

You will find three additional sets of pages 2, 3, and 4 (language arts subgroup observation) for each observation in your packet. Be sure and take enough of these with you. Please clip the completed, additional subgroup sets to the observation guide after each half-day observation.

Observation of Other Curriculum Areas

During the course of a day in a paired classroom and a half day in a single classroom, you will observe instruction in other subject matter areas. Complete the single page form for these observations. If you follow a language arts floater, you probably will not have an entry here. When judging the teachers' instructional and behavioral styles, refer back to the language arts subgroup observation guide for the scale items listed for each of those styles; select the appropriate one and record that number in the table.

In classrooms where there is more than one teacher present, a major item of interest is whether or not all teachers present are actively involved. Usually you can assume that if a second teacher is present, but not involved, it is not her assigned prep period. However, you need to know this for sure. You can make this check unobtrusively by asking the teachers, during their interviews, where their prep periods are. In the column headed, Number of Teachers Involved, note "1-prep" if you find that the uninvolved teacher is a prep period at the time.

Housing and Equipment

You are asked to evoke judgments about the relationship of size of classrooms and number of children assigned to them, and availability of working space in locations outside the classroom. Criteria for these judgments will be set in our last briefing session.

Complete the materials checklist independently during the course of the day, or half day, in a classroom. Check what you observe; don't go poking in cupboards (Thus, the "Not in View" category). If you have time during the teacher interview, you may want to check on some items.

Time Samples of Deployment of Space, Staff and Children

The purpose of this sampling is to observe (1) the deployment of children from a given class to total group, subgroup, and individual settings, (2) the roles and number of school staff working with these children during the course of a half day (or whole day in a paired classroom), and (3) building locations used. No observation of instruction is to be made, other than to identify the subject matter content.

Where a group leaves the classroom with a teacher, you must ask her where you can find her later. If the teacher sends a group on an errand (i.e., take books to A.P.'s office), or a child is out as a monitor during one of the sampling times, record "errand" or "monitor" as the activity. All children must be represented as being somewhere, whether they are in an instructional setting or not. Try to catch as much as you can when a teacher is giving directions, so you don't have to interrupt and ask where you can find children.

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

Please complete the SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT after you have completed all observations and interviews in a given school. Look this over ahead, so you will have in mind some of the things upon which you are asked to make judgments.

Grade______
Paired_____; AM_____, PM_____, or AM & PM combined_____
Single_____; AM_____, PM_____
Classroom Teacher(s)_____ Floater_____

EC-05
Spring

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE

School____________ Borough____________ Date____________ Observer____________

Class Register______ No. Children Present______ No. Paraprofessionals______

Teacher's Name (s) __________________________, ______________________________

Language Arts Observation

Three tables follow, one for recording total group work, one for small group work, and one for individual work in reading and other language arts areas.

TABLE 1

Language Arts
Total Group Instruction*

Lesson Content	Materials (Texts, trade books, workbooks, games, etc)	No. Children Present	No. Tchrs. Present	No. Tchrs Involved	Time Spent
Reading (specify content) 1.					
2.					
3.					
Other Language Arts Story (telling and listening)					
Experience Charts					
Dramatics					
Hand Writing					
Writing					
Spelling					
Library					
Oral Lang. (pictures, discussion)					
Other (specify)					

*Total group refers to all children present in the classroom, with the exception of one or two who left for some reason.

No. total group reading lessons_______ Total time___hrs.___minutes
No. total group other L.A. lessons_____ Total time___hrs.___minutes
No. total group lessons held outside of the classroom_________
No. of different teachers involved in conducting total groups________
No. of adults, other than teachers, involved in conducting total groups____

TABLE 2

Language Arts
Small Group Instruction

Lesson Content	Materials	No. Children Present	No. Tchrs. Present	No. Tchrs. Involved	Time Spent
Reading (including N.E.)					
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
Other Language Arts					
Story (telling and listening)					
Experience Charts					
Dramatics					
Hand Writing					
Writing					
Spelling					
Library Work					
Oral Lang. (pictures, discussion)					
Other (specify)					

No. small group reading lessons______ Total time____hrs.____minutes
No. small group other L.A. lessons____ Total time____hrs.____minutes
No. small group lessons held outside of the classroom_____________
No. of different teachers involved in conducting small groups_________
No. of adults, other than teachers, involved in conducting small groups____

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

Language Arts
Individual Instruction*

Conference Content	Materials of Instruction	Time/Conference
Reading (oral reading, phonics, N.E., discussion)		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
Other Language Arts		
Dictated Story		
Hand Writing		
Writing		
Spelling		
Oral. Lang.		
Other (specify)		

*Individual instruction refers to one child and one adult apart from the group.

No. of individual conferences in reading______Total time___hrs.___minutes
No. of individual conferences in other L.A. areas___Total time__hrs.__minutes
No. of individual conferences held outside of the classroom________
No. of different teachers involved in conducting conferences________
No. of adults, other than teachers, involved in conducting conferences_____

Additional Comments

School______
Paired Class: AM___ PM___ AM & PM___ (check one) Single Class: AM___ PM___

TABLE 4

Observation of Other Instructional Areas

Area	Content	Materials	Grouping Arrangement			Teachers Present		Teachers Involved	
			More Than One Class	One Total Class	Small Groups Within Class	No. Clrm. Tchrs.	No. Other Tchrs.	No. Clrm. Tchrs.	No. Other Tchrs.
Science									
Social Studies									
Mathematics									
Arts									
Music									
Physical Education									

Additional Comments

School_______ Class______ Paired______Single______ AM______PM______

Instructions: Enter each change in the classroom which occurs. This includes, change of content, teacher, groups of children entering or leaving, changing groups within the room, and change in use of instructional materials.

TABLE 5

Observed Daily Schedule

Clock Time	Content	Type of Instruction: lecture, drill, etc.	Materials of Instruction	# Children	# Tchrs. With Chldrn.	# Addl. Adults

As compared to the observed setting on your first visit:

6. Were there any additional materials present in the classroom? Yes___ No___

   If yes, what were the additions?

7. Was there any notable change in the pattern of instruction within this classroom? Yes___ No___ If yes, describe the change.

8. Was there any change in the quality of instruction within this classroom?

   Yes___ No___

   If yes, describe the change.

9. Additional Comments

Center for Urban Education

Early Childhood: Grades 1 and 2

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE

Obs: b,c
P.S.____

AM ___ PM___

School__________ Borough__________ Date_________ Interviewer/Observer_________

Grade________ Register_________ No. Children Present____________

Teacher's Position: Classroom Teacher_________ Floater_______ Other_________

Kind of Setting: Paired______ Single_______ Other (specify)_________

Total number of Adults working in the setting during the half day session_____

No. of classroom teachers_______

No. of Aides _______

No. of Students or Assistant Teachers _______

Other (specify)_____ _______

Classroom Teacher's Name(s)

1 ______________________________

2 ______________________________

Language Arts Observation

1. What was the pattern of grouping for language arts instruction?

Language Arts Groups	Teacher's Name(s)	Position	Basis for Grouping	No. of Children	Language Arts Content	Setting
Group 1						
Group 2						
Group 3						
Group 3						
Individual 1						
Individual 2						

Additional comments:

2. To which group does the observation to follow apply?

   Group 1, 2, 3, 4, ... Individual 1, 2, ... (circle one)

3. Basis for grouping (i.e., interest, ability, tract, N.E., etc.)_______

4. What are the materials of instruction, their appropriateness for the task, and their appropriateness to the background needs of children?

Materials of Instruction (specify after each item)	Appropriateness to the Task*	Appropriateness to Background**
Basal Series______________		
Trade Books______________		
Workbooks______________		
Supplementary Basal Materials____________		
Other Commercial Materials____________ (i.e. games, pictures)		
Teacher-made Materials____________		
Chart Paper____________		
Other________________		

*Select one of the following and enter after each material used

1. Appropriate and a variety used
2. appropriate, but no variety
3. slightly appropriate
4. not appropriate (why?)

**Select one of the following and enter after each material used

1. background needs considered and a variety used
2. background needs considered, but no variety
3. background needs slightly considered
4. not relevant to background needs
5. don't know

Additional comments

5. What was the specific task(s) of the group or individual session?

Task	Specific Work
Phonics	
Word Recognition	
Oral Reading	
English Vocabulary	
Comprehension	
Concept Development	
Dictated Stories	
Listening	
Other	
Informal Diagnostic Testing	

Additional comments

6. What was the teacher's instructional style? (circle number)

   1. Completely transactional*
   2. Transactional, but not completely
   3. Slightly transactional
   4. Slightly nontransactional**
   5. Completely nontransactional**

   *Transactional - interactive, mutual contributions by children and teacher, involving, spontaneous element

   **Nontransactional - child is receptor only

   Basis for response

7. What was the teacher's behavioral style? (circle number)

   1. Completely positive*
   2. Positive, but not completely
   3. Slightly positive
   4. Slightly negative**
   5. Clearly negative

   *Positive - warm, supportive, accepting

   **Negative - harsh, non-supportive, criticizing

   Basis for response

8. What was the involvement of the children? (circle one)

   1. Number clearly involved________
   2. Number clearly not involved_____
   3. Number actively not involved___
   4. Number passively not involved___
   5. Don't know____________________

   What was the total number of children in the group setting? __________

   Basis for response

9. Additional comments on lesson

Observation of Other Instructional Areas

10. What other instructional areas did you observe?

Area	Content	Materials	Number Children Present	Number Teachers Present	Number Teachers Involved	Role of Teachers Involved	Instructional Style of Teachers	Behavioral Style of Teachers
Science						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Social Studies						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Hand-Writing						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Mathematics						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Arts						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Music						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Physical Education						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.
Other (specify)						A. B.	A. B.	A. B.

11. Additional comments on other lessons (use back of page if necessary)

Housing and Equipment

12. What was the space relationship of size of classroom and number of children? (circle one)

    1. ample
    2. adequate
    3. barely adequate
    4. slightly inadequate
    5. completely inadequate

    Basis for response

13. How would you ludge the amount of space available for meeting places outside the classroom for subgroups and individual work? (circle one)

    1. ample
    2. adequate
    3. barely adequate
    4. slightly inadequate
    5. completely inadequate

    Basis for response

14. Additional comments on the half-day observation

MATERIALS CHECKLIST

AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM
Language Arts	Basal Readers				
	Basal Supplementary Paraphernalia				
	Workbooks				
	Worksheets (commercial)				
	Games				
	Pictures (commercial)				
	Tradebooks				
	Chartpaper				
	Teacher-made Materials				
	Tape Recorder				
	Record Player				
	Flannel Board				
	Puppets				
	Dramatics				
	Other (specify)				
Mathematics	Counters (specify)				
	Clock				
	Magneticboard and checkers				
	Counting frames				
	Fraction pies or frames				
	Workbooks				

AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM
Mathematics (cont.)	Linear units of measure (specify)				
	Liquid and bulk units of measure (specify)				
	Games				
	Other (specify)				
Manipulative Materials	Peg set, interlocking sets				
	Puzzles				
	Other (specify)				
Science	Earth Science (rocks, etc.)				
	Living Things				
	Physical Science (magnets, elect. equip., etc.)				
	Other (specify)				
Social Science	Economics Study				
	Pictures				
	Other (specify)				
Arts	Plastic arts (clay, etc.)				

AREA	MATERIALS	ADEQUATE	AVAILABLE LIMITED	IN USE	NOT IN VIEW IN ROOM
Arts (cont.)	Graphic arts (paint, crayons)				
	Crafts materials (scissors, paste)				
	Tools (hammer, saw, etc.)				
Music	Instruments				
	Piano				

DIAGRAMS OF DEPLOYMENT OF SPACE, CHILDREN, AND TEACHERS AT FOUR DIFFERENT INTERVALS

School_________ Borough________ Grade_______ Date_______ Observer__________

x = child; O = teachers

Time (check one) Home Classroom Other Location (specify)

8:45___
12:30___
(starting time)

Teacher A___________ Activity_________ Teacher A_______ Activity_______
(role) B___________ _________ B_______ _______

9:15___
1:00___

Teacher A___________ Activity_________ Teacher A_______ Activity_______
B___________ _________ B_______ _______

10:30___
2:00___

Teacher A___________ Activity_________ Teacher A_______ Activity_______
B___________ _________ B_______ _______

11:00___
2:30___

Teacher A___________ Activity_________ Teacher A_______ Activity_______
B___________ _________ B_______ _______

Total number of different personnel_______
List roles___________________No._______
___________________No._______
___________________No._______
___________________No._______
___________________No._______
___________________No._______

Total number of large class groupings___
Total number of subgroupings___
Total number of individual settings___

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS OBSERVED

Schools ________, ________, ________ Observer ______________________________

1. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 1 program? (circle one)

    a. continue as now organized
    b. continue, but modify organization
    c. discontinue

    If you responded a or c, why?

    If you responded b, describe modifications you would recommend.

    a.

    b.

    c.

    d.

    e.

2. How do you feel about the continuation of the current grade 2 program? (circle one)

    a. continue as now organized
    b. continue, but modify organization
    c. discontinue

If you responded a or c, why?

If you responded b, describe modifications you would recommend.

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

3. Which school that you visited had the best grade 1 program? PS________

4. What three factors do you think contributed most to the success of that program?

   a.

   b.

   c.

5. Which school that you visited had the best grade 2 program? PS________

6. What three factors do you think contributed most to the success of that program?

   a.

   b.

   c.

7. When a program was not going well, what three factors (other than the competency of the teachers) usually contributed most to its lack of success?

a.

b.

c.

8. How many programs that you observed included floating teachers?

In grade 1 ________ Schools ________ ________

In grade 2 ________ Schools ________ ________

9. What assets do you attribute to the floating teacher pattern?

In grade 1

In grade 2

10. What liabilities do you attribute to the floating teacher pattern?

In grade 1

In grade 2

11. How many classrooms that you visited had a paraprofessional?

In grade 1 ________ Schools ________ ________

In grade 2 ________ Schools ________ ________

12. How many classrooms of those you observed evidenced a fragmented program:

Grade 1 paired ________ single ________

Grade 2 paired ________ paired ________

13. Of those programs evidencing a fragmented program, cite causes judged most important:

	Organizational Plan	Teacher Competency
# Grade 1 paired	________________	________________
# Grade 1 single	________________	________________
# Grade 2 paired	________________	________________
#Grade 2 single	________________	________________

14. What was the range of class registers?

SINGLE CLASSES

Lowest Single Class Register	Highest Single Class Register
Grade 1: # ________, P.S. ________	# ________, P.S. ________
Grade 2: # ________, P.S. ________	# ________, P.S. ________

PAIRED CLASSES

Lowest	Highest
Grade 1: # ________, P.S. ________	# ________, P.S. ________
Grade 2: # ________, P.S. ________	# ________, P.S. ________

15. Additional comments. (Use back of sheet if necessary.)

Total No. AM Paired Class Observations ______
Total No. PM Paired Class Observations ______

Grade 1, Paired

Summary Table of Instruction in Areas Other Than Language Arts
For All Grade 1 PAIRED Winter and Spring Observations

Area	Total No. Lessons Observed	Total No. Obs. of			Total No. Obs. of	Total No. Obs. of	Total No. Obs. of
		More Than One Class Group	One Total Class Group	Small	Only One Teacher Present	2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	2 or more tchrs. present and Involved
Science Winter							
Spring							
Social Studies Winter							
Spring							
Mathematics Winter							
Spring							
Arts Winter							
Spring							
Music Winter							
Spring							
Phys. Educ. Winter							
Spring							

Total No. AM Single Class Observations ____
Total No. PM Single Class Observations ____

Grade 1, Single

Summary Table of Instruction in Areas Other Than Language Arts For ALL Grade 1 SINGLE Winter and Spring Observations

Area	Total No. Lessons Observed	Total No. Obs. of More Than One Class Group	Total No. Obs. of One Total Class Group	Total No. Obs. of Small Groups	Total No. Obs. of Only One Teacher Present	Total No. Obs. of 2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	Total No. Obs. of 2 or More Tchrs. Present or Involved
Science Winter							
Spring							
Social Studies Winter							
Spring							
Mathematics Winter							
Spring							
Arts Winter							
Spring							
Music Winter							
Spring							
Phys. Educ. Winter							
Spring							

Total No. AM Paired Class Observations ______
Total No. PM Paired Class Observations ______

Grade 2, Paired

Summary Table of Instruction in Areas Other Than Language Arts
For ALL Grade 2 PAIRED Winter and Spring Observations

		Total No. Obs. of			Total No. Obs. of	Total No. Obs. of	Total No. Obs. of
Area	Total No. Lessons Observed	More Than One Class Group	One Total Class Group	Small Groups	Only One Teacher Present	2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	2 or More Tchrs. Present or Involved
Science Winter							
Spring							
Social Studies Winter							
Spring							
Mathematics Winter							
Spring							
Arts Winter							
Spring							
Music Winter							
Spring							
Phys. Educ. Winter							
Spring							

Total No. AM Single Class Observations _____
Total No. PM Single Class Observations _____

Grade 2, Single

Summary Table of Instruction in Areas Other Than Language Arts for ALL Grade 2 SINGLE Winter and Spring Observations

Area	Total No. Lessons Observed	Total No. Obs. of			Total No. Obs. of	Total No. Obs. of	Total No. Obs. of
		More Than One Class Group	One Total Class Group	Small Groups	Only One Teacher Present	2 or More Tchrs. Pres., 1 Involved	2 or More Tchrs. Present or Involved
Science Winter							
Spring							
Social Studies Winter							
Spring							
Mathematics Winter							
Spring							
Arts Winter							
Spring							
Music Winter							
Spring							
Phys. Educ. Winter							
Spring							

EC-05

SPRING SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

School ____ Borough ______ Date ___________ Observer ___________________

1. What is the organization of classes in this school?

Grade 1	Grade 2
_____ All paired	_____ All paired
_____ All single	_____ All single
_____ Both paired and single	_____ Both paired and single
Floaters: ____ Yes ____ No	Floaters: ____ Yes ____ No
Grade(s) ____	Grade(s) ____
Paraprofessionals: ____Yes ____No	Paraprofessionals: ____Yes ____ No
Grade(s) ____	Grade(s) ____

2. What changes have occurred in the grade 1 program since your winter visit? (check and describe any changes in the categories below)

No Change	Positive Change	Negative Change	Kind of Change
_____	_____	_____	a. Organizational (more or less paired classes, subgroups, rooms used, different deployment of staff, etc.)
_____	_____	_____	b. Approach (more individualization, more or less work, joint planning evidenced, etc.)
_____	_____	_____	c. Availability and Utilization of Materials (more trade books used, additional A-V equipment, etc.)
_____	_____	_____	d. Personnel (more or fewer teachers or paraprofessionals and how many are involved in the changes)

No Change	Positive Change	Negative Change	Kind of Change
______	______	______	e. Quality of Instruction
______	______	______	f. Coordinator (difference in effectiveness, aspects of role assumed, attitude, etc.)
______	______	______	g. Rapport Among Staff (feelings about pairing, working as a team, etc.)
______	______	______	h. Other (specify)

Additional comments:

3. What changes have occurred in the grade 2 program since your winter visit? (check and describe any changes in the categories below)

No Change	Positive Change	Negative Change	Kind of Change
____	____	____	a. Organizational (more or less paired classes, floaters, and/or subgrouping, additional rooms used, deployment of staff, etc.)
____	____	____	b. Approach (more individualization, more or less unit work, joint planning evidenced, etc.)
____	____	____	c. Availability and Utilization of Materials (more trade books used, additional A-V equipment, etc.)
____	____	____	d. Personnel (more or fewer teachers or paraprofessionals and how many)
____	____	____	e. Quality of Instruction
____	____	____	f. Coordinator
____	____	____	g. Rapport Among Staff
____	____	____	h. Other

Additional comments:

School _______

Grade 1, Paired

Summary Table of Language Arts Instruction for a Whole Day
In a PAIRED Grade 1 Class for Winter and Spring

	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in Instruction			
Observation	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Licensed Tchrs.	Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter										
Spring										

Grade 2, Paired

Summary Table of Language Arts Instruction for a Whole Day
In a PAIRED Grade 2 Class for Winter and Spring

	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in Instruction			
Observation	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Licensed Tchrs.	Other Adults	Total Adults
Winter										
Spring										

School ________

Grade 1, Single

Summary Table of All Language Arts Instruction for a Half Day
In SINGLE Grade 1 Classes for Winter and Spring

(Do not include half day observations only in paired classes; omit that observation in recording here. Match the same classrooms for Winter(W) and Spring (S) comparison, entering class register for each.)

Observation	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in All L.A. Instr.			
	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Tchrs.	No.Other Adults	Total Adults
Oversized Register Size										
W,1 ____										
S,1 ____										
W,2 ____										
S,2 ____										
Regular Register Size										
W,1 ____										
S,1 ____										
W,2 ____										
S,2 ____										
W,3 ____										
S,3 ____										

School _______

Grade 2, Single

Summary Table of All Language Arts Instructions for a Half Day In SINGLE Grade 2 Classes for Winter and Spring

(Do not include half day observations only in paired classes; omit that observation in recording here. Match the same classrooms for Winter(W) and Spring(S) comparison, entering class register for each.)

Observation	Reading Lessons			Other Lang. Arts Lessons			Adults Involved in All L.A. Instr.			
	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Total Group	No.Small Group	No.Individual	No.Clrm. Tchrs.	No.Other Tchrs.	No.Other Adults	Total Adults
Oversized Register Size										
W,1										
S,1										
W,2										
S,2										
Regular Register Size										
W,1										
S,1										
W,2										
S,2										
W,3										
S,3										

APPENDIX C

Staff List - Section I

Dr. Mary Wilsberg, Evaluation Director
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Queens College of the
City University of New York

Dr. Sydney L. Schwartz, Evaluation Coordinator
Research Associate
Teachers College
Columbia University

Athena Kousouros
Data Tabulation

Yolanda Soto
Typist

APPENDIX D

Estimation of independent change ($\hat{G}$)

The formulas for calculating independent and dependent change are from an article by Tucker, Damarin, and Messick in the December 1966 issue of Psychometrika.[1] The numbers in parentheses to the right of the formulas correspond to those in that article.

Independent change, $\hat{G} = X_{i2} - \hat{a}X_{i1}$ (26) is an estimate of the true score difference between an individual's second test score and his first test score when change attributable to differences on the first test are removed. The value $\hat{a}$ is "the ordinary regression of the observed scores of the second test on the observed scores of the first test divided by the reliability of the first test."[2]

$$\hat{a} = \frac{r_{x1x2}S_{x2}}{r_{x1x1}S_{x1}} \qquad (21)$$

In this study the first test is the New York State Readiness Test total score. The test manual's lowest estimate of odd-even corrected reliability is .91.

Because of an oversight of the writer, the independent change scores were calculated using this value rather than the sample reliabilities, which is the correct procedure. When the error was discovered, Kuder-Richardson Formula (21) reliabilities were obtained for both the project sample and the comparison group. These values, .91 for the project sample and .93 for the comparison group, differ so little from the figure used that it was unnecessary to recalculate the scores.

The correlation between the first and second tests and the standard deviations were calculated separately for each group.

---

[1] Tucker, Ledyard R., Damarin, Fred, and Messick, Samuel. "A Basefree Measure of Change," Psychometrika, 31 (4), (December 1966).

[2] Ibid., p. 462.

Estimation of dependent change ($\hat{W}$)

Dependent change is change that is entirely predictable from the first measure. Using the same symbols as above, dependent change is equal to the product of $\hat{a}$ minus one and the subject's score on the first test.

$$\hat{W}_i = (\hat{a} - 1)\, X_{i1} \qquad (31)$$

APPENDIX E

SOURCES OF VARIANCE OF DATA CONTAINED IN TABLE 3

New York State Readiness Total Scores

	SS	df	MS	F
Between	9,567.04	1	9,567.04	34.90[a]
Within	449,828.37	1641	274.11	

[a] $p < .01$

Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Subtest

	SS	df	MS	F
Between	226.41	1	226.41	3.90[b]
Within	95,258.21	1641	58.04	

[b] $p < .05$

Test of the Homogeneity of Residual Variance for New York State Readiness and Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary

	df	MS	F
Groups	1	860.50	9.92[c]
Residual	1639	86.70	

[c] $p < .01$

Test of the Homogeneity of Residual Variance for New York State Readiness and Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension

	df	MS	F
Groups	1	379.47	10.29[d]
Residual	1639	36.87	

[d] $p < .01$

APPENDIX F

Staff List - Section II

Lawrence V. Castiglione, Evaluation Director
Assistant Professor
Research Director
Department of Education
Queens College of the City
  University of New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

~~4 New Y~~

09313 E

New York City - General

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATIONS

SUMMARY REPORT

Date: October 1968

Project: (05BCD68) A Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools:

Section I - Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio Grade I
Reduction of Pupil-Teacher Ratio Grade II
Additional Materials - Grades 1-2

Section II -- Testing Program

Section I - Evaluation Director
Mary Wilsberg
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Queens College of the City
University of New York

Section II - Evaluation Director
Lawrence V. Castiglione
Assistant Professor
Research Director
Department of Education
Queens College of the City
University of New York

Evaluation Coordinator
Sydney L. Schwartz
Research Associate
Teachers College
Columbia University

UD 009 313

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERV
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCAT

A PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN POVERTY AREAS IN NEW YORK CITY

PARTS B: C: D:

PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM

The major purpose of the program was to improve the reading level of children by means of a smaller pupil-teacher ratio and the use of additional materials. ESEA funds provided for the addition of teachers in poverty area schools to achieve the pupil-teacher ratio of one to 15 in first grades and one to twenty in second grades. A program coordinator was also added to aid the implementation (Parts B and C). ESEA funds provided for an eight dollar per child expenditure for additional materials, one dollar of which was designated for the purchase of paperback books intended to build children's personal libraries (Part D).

The implementation of the Program to Strengthen Early Childhood Education in Poverty Area Schools (SEC program) was intended to be varied. Individual schools determined their own organizational pattern, based on program emphases specified as follows:

Understanding of developmental needs of little children;
of special needs of the disadvantaged
Curriculum for early childhood
Methods of teaching reading
Enrichment of materials for building the reading program
Diagnosis of reading difficulties
Evaluation of progress
Teacher training
Community and parent involvement, participation,and training

PROCEDURE

The major purpose of the evaluation was to describe the implementation of the SEC program in 25 poverty area schools and to estimate its potential strengths and weaknesses. The program was implemented in 240 special service schools located in 25 of the 30 school districts in New York City. A random selection of one special service school in each participating district (excluding Richmond County) provided a sample population of 24 schools. In addition, one school receiving the SEC program, though not designated as a special service school, was added to establish a sample population of 25 schools in 25 districts, a sample of slightly above 10 per cent.

In each school in the sample three first grades and two second grades were observed. The observed 75 first grades represented a 5 per cent sample of the funded first grades (1,450) and the 50 second grades represented a 9 per cent of the funded second grades (620). A variety of classroom organizations was chosen within the sample schools, and the program coordinator was asked to select both experienced and inexperienced teachers for observation.

To extend this investigation beyond the sample schools, a random selection was made of two first grade teachers and one second grade teacher in each special service school in the city. Questionnaires were mailed to these teachers in April. This additional population brought the sample of teachers contacted up to 33 per cent at each grade level.

The evaluation team consisted of nine observer/interviewers. Each observer had a background of work experience in the elementary school and was currently engaged in teacher education in colleges of the City University of New York.

Two kinds of data were gathered: material, based on structured observation guides, for first and second grade observational visits, which were made in January and February and again in May and early June; information obtained through interviews and questionnaires directed to principals, primary assistant principals, coordinators, teachers, and early childhood education district supervisors. The instruments were designed to yield data on: (1.) organization for instruction and deployment of staff, children, and space; (2.) the content and materials of the instructional program, particularly in reading; (3.) the perceptions of school staff and observers of the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

FINDINGS

Three designations of classroom organization were found: single classes with one teacher, paired classes with two teachers, and a floating or ratio teacher arrangement where an additional teacher worked in two or three classrooms on a regularly scheduled basis. The paired class organization was found more frequently in first grades; the floater arrangement was found more frequently in second grades. Some schools had only paired first grade classes, some had only single classes, and others had a combination of paired, single, and floater arrangements. Limitation of space was the major and determining factor in overall program organization.

The most frequently found pattern of grouping for instruction in paired classrooms was that of each teacher working with a subgroup in reading and dividing the responsibility for instruction in other curriculum areas. In single reduced ratio classes, the majority of teachers had total group instruction throughout the day. Class size for single first grade classes observed ranged from 13 to 31 children, and for paired first grade classes, from 23 to 37 children. Second grade single class size ranged from 17 to 29, paired classes from 29 to 41, and classes with floaters from 26 to 33 children.

In implementation, the SEC program was an additive program without basic, overall restructuring of organization. The single class concept continued to serve as the base of operation even when the responsibility for instruction in a class was shared by two or more teachers; floater and cluster teachers worked in someone else's class and many paired teachers assumed responsibility mainly for their own registers, except when taking turns instructing the whole group in curriculum areas other than reading. The addition of other than single classroom teaching positions, with little provision for cooperative planning for building integrated curriculums, contributed to fragmentation of the instructional program within a class.

The content of reading instruction was centered on structured text materials. Although a considerable portion of the school day was spent in reading skills instruction, opportunities to develop language concepts and to apply reading in other curriculum areas were seldom utilized. The provision of paperback books was an asset to the program.

The majority of school personnel perceived the SEC program as having some positive effect on children's reading ability. Classroom observations revealed that individual instruction seldom took place, total group instruction often took place in reduced ratio single classes, and subgrouping in paired classes usually took place only in reading. However, many teachers reported they felt they knew children better, gave more individualized attention, and worked with smaller groups in reading instruction. The discrepancy in this data is interpreted as an indication that teachers value an organizational plan that allows for closer contact between teacher and pupils, but that they need help in finding ways to utilize the plan more fully in order to realize the potentials of a reduced pupil-teacher ratio. The number of instructional groups in reading tended to depend on the number of teachers present within a classroom at a given time. Reduced teacher-pupil ratio undoubtedly reduced the size of instructional groups, but it did not bring about widespread practices of individualizing and subgrouping within classes.

OVERALL EVALUATIVE STATEMENT

The potential in restructuring organization for instruction as a vehicle for providing positive working and learning settings for teachers and children also operates to foster necessary professional growth and curriculum modification, if cooperative planning, decision-making at various levels, and constructive supervision are incorporated into the overall framework of organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Base the number of teaching personnel allotted to a school for a specific grade level on a designated, overall teacher-pupil ratio, without the requirement of separate registers for ratio purposes; this practice created an artificial barrier which impeded development of joint planning and shared responsibility for instruction.

2. Provide time for cooperative planning within each school prior to the implementation of a program involving substantial organizational change and staff additions.

3. Where multiple teacher/class organizations are in effect, create teams of teachers responsible for instructing a given group of children, with the leadership of a master teacher. Delineate teaching responsibilities among teamed teachers to provide for optimum use of professional services and to avoid confusion. Incorporate consistent, cooperative team planning for the development of an integrated curriculum and for evaluating pupil progress.

4. Eliminate the concept of "coverage." Provide for teacher preparation periods within the program of instruction and schedules of a team of teachers. Incorporate team cooperative planning periods with some teacher preparation periods.

5. Utilize units within the curriculum to incorporate learning to read with reading to learn, to foster language concept development, and to build integrated curriculums.

6. Continue the provision of paperback books to build personal libraries. Provide for teacher and child participation in selection of books.

7. Continue and redefine the role of coordinator to emphasize: provision of direct help for teachers in organizing for instruction within classrooms, in classroom management practices, and in developing teaching skills; assumption of leadership in organizing and supervising cooperative planning among teachers; exploration of more effective approaches for parent involvement; and clear delineation of the roles of coordinator and primary assistant to principal, with the elimination of routine administrative tasks from the coordinator's role.

8. Provide well stocked and staffed curriculum materials resource centers within schools and at district headquarters that may serve as depots where school personnel can see, select, and learn to use materials.

9. Provide more building space in crowded areas, with designations of space and equipment for laboratory centers for subgroup work, resource centers, and parent rooms.

10. In future investigations, attempt to determine the number of professional personnel that can be absorbed and utilized effectively in crowded schools.

SECTION II - TESTING PROGRAM

Procedure

A proportional random sample of 16 schools was drawn from the population of 266 schools participating in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program (SEC), providing a grade 1 sample population of approximately 2,400 pupils. In addition, a comparison group of eight schools with an ethnic composition similar to that of the selected SEC program schools was drawn, providing a grade 1 population of approximately 1,000 pupils.

The New York State Readiness Test was administered to all grade 1 pupils in October 1967, and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Achievement Test, Primary A was administered to the sample and comparison groups in June 1968. Both tests were administered by the classroom teacher. Tests were scored and data processed by the Educational Records Bureau in New York City.

Treatment of the Data

A new technique was used that permits calculation of the degree of change in reading performance which cannot be predicted from readiness test scores - the independent change. Independent change may be thought of as resulting from factors relevant to reading achievement but not measured by, or predictable from, readiness tests. In the present investigation, the amount of positive independent change was used as an indicant of the extent to which the changes in pupil-teacher ratio and the addition of materials have resulted in successful intervention into the educational life of the children. Raw scores were converted to standard scores, and analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences between the project and comparison groups' mean independent change for each variable.

Findings

The findings are based upon scores obtained from 1,127 pupils in the project schools and 516 pupils in the comparison schools, which represents an approximate 50 per cent reduction in the original sample. The two groups differed significantly in school readiness, the difference favoring the comparison group. The comparison group mean fell at the lower end of the "Average" category, and the project sample mean fell at the upper end of the "Low Normal" category, according to the manual for the New York State Readiness Test.

The Gates-MacGinitie Test scores showed a highly significant difference between the two groups' mean true independent change scores in comprehension, favoring the project sample. Although, in terms of raw scores, the comparison group was superior to the project sample, there was a significantly greater improvement by the project sample from October to June.

Conclusions

The investigation indicated that project sample pupils showed some improvement and comparison group-pupils showed evidence of progressive retardation. This difference in performance which is both statistically significant and educationally important, leads to the conclusion that the stated goal of the SEC program, i.e., to improve reading and to prevent progressive retardation in reading, has been achieved with the sampled children.